NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DXCIII.

APRIL, 1906.

WHOM WILL THE DEMOCRATS NEXT NOMINATE FOR PRESIDENT?

BY A JEFFERSONIAN DEMOCRAT.

It is high time that thoughtful Democrats should begin to consider the question, on what issue they mean to appeal to the American people in 1908, and what standard-bearer is most likely to lead their hosts to victory. A new Federal House of Representatives will be chosen in November of this year; so will many Governors; so will many State Legislatures, which, in their turn, may powerfully affect the composition of the Federal Senate. The rank and file of the Democracy will be immensely encouraged in their effort to pluck success from the coming contest at the ballot-box, if they know that their leaders, far from maintaining an expectant attitude, and allowing things to drift, have agreed upon a sound and attractive policy, and are prepared to name a candidate for the Presidency who shall be "available" in the true sense of the word, through his power to inspire confidence, to command respect, and to secure the zealous support of the Independents, who in 1884 and in 1892 proved themselves able to turn the scale.

I.

So far as the framing of an issue is concerned, it should

Copyright, 1906, by The North American Review Publishing Company All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prove a much easier task for Democrats than for Republicans. As regards the two great questions of tariff revision and the regulation of interstate railways and other great corporations engaged in interstate commerce, the Republican party seems to be irreparably ruptured. Only with the help of Democratic Senators, if at all, will Mr. Roosevelt be able to place a rate-making bill embodying his personal views upon the statute-book. It follows that Government control of consolidated capital cannot be made a pivotal issue at the next Presidential election. It is true that the Democrats may justly claim to have upheld from the outset the popular demand for Federal supervision of huge railway combinations and of all formidable trusts; but the Republicans may as justly say that the same demand was recognized and pressed by their Executive chief in the White House, by many of their Senators and by all but seven of their Representatives. It would, therefore, be difficult, if not impracticable, to make the election of 1906, or that of 1908, turn on the Trust issue. It is otherwise with the question of tariff revision. The Protectionist Republicans, or Stand-Patters, have shown themselves absolute masters of their party, in both the Senate and the House of Representatives; for, if they permitted the House to pass the Philippine tariff bill, it was with the foreknowledge that the measure was going to its grave in a Senatorial committee. President Roosevelt, who, some time ago, was an advocate of tariff revision, seems to have bowed to the inevitable, and, of late, has evinced no inclination to urge reductions of the Dingley Tariff. On the other hand, the Republican friends of revision in the Fifty-ninth Congress, though relatively few, are resolute and impassioned, and have betrayed more than once a willingness to organize a revolt against the dominant element of their party, and their spirit of insubordination is strengthened by the knowledge that, in many sections of the country, the movement for revision is gaining great momentum even among Republican voters. We doubt if it would be possible to find a single Independent—by which, of course, we mean a man who in theory and practice is non-partisan —who is not also an avowed and earnest revisionist. Under the circumstances, the Democrats are not so much called upon to make tariff revision the axial issue of the contests in 1906 and 1908, as they are to accept frankly and eagerly an axial issue already made for them. That they will hail such an issue with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enthusiasm is obvious. A party which in the past has demanded a tariff for revenue could not fail to welcome revision as at least a step in the right direction.

We see, then, that tariff revision, which events have made the main plank in the Democratic platform, will strongly commend Democratic candidates, provided these are wisely selected, not only to the great scale-turning body of Independents, but also to that large and growing minority of Republicans whose party allegiance is slack compared with the firmness of their demand for certain reductions of the Dingley tariff. Under the circumstances, Democrats should be able to repeat in Massachusetts the triumph gained by Governor William L. Douglas two years ago. In New York, where the Republican party is rent by faction, the Democrats certainly should be able to do much better next November than they did in 1902, when they cut down Governor Odell's plurality to less than nine thousand votes. They ought not to miss victory in Pennsylvania, where their nominee for State Treasurer was elected less than five months ago. Bright also is their prospect of carrying Ohio, where their candidate for Governor was successful at the latest election. They will surely recover Missouri, which only for transient reasons gave her electoral votes to Mr. Roosevelt in 1904. They have a right to expect considerable gains in Maine, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin and Iowa, where there are many tariff-revisionists in the Republican ranks. On the whole, the Democracy seems pretty well assured of preponderance in the next House of Representatives.

II.

Having thus proved successful in the preliminary skirmish, what step should next be taken by the national Democracy in order to win the great battle for the Presidency? It will not avail them to have the right platform: they must have the right candidate as well. They had the right platform in 1880, and, if, with or without his consent, they had nominated Samuel J. Tilden, feeble and moribund as he was, they would have proved as irresistible as were the Christian cavaliers of Spain when they charged with the dead Cid at their head clad in his armor and propped upon his war-horse. That they had the right platform in that year is evident from the fact that President Arthur soon after recognized the necessity of revision, and brought about the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creation of a Commission for the purpose. In 1884, the Democrats did not win by virtue of their platform, which was an evasive one, but because a large fraction of the Republicans in pivotal States bolted from Mr. Blaine and voted for Mr. Cleveland. In 1888, Mr. Cleveland stood on the right platform, but the nonpartisans were inactive. Four years later, the Independents rallied; and, as there was simultaneously a good deal of discord among Republican leaders, caused by Mr. Harrison's frigid treatment of many of them, Mr. Cleveland's victory was monumental. It is our judgment that in 1904, after Judge Parker's electrifying telegram to the St. Louis Convention had blazoned in deathless colors his fidelity to the gold standard, the Democratic candidate could not have been beaten by any man except Mr. Roosevelt, who, although not, by principle and by practice, a Jeffersonian Democrat, as Senator Tillman justly says, had at that time proclaimed his approval of two Democratic demands, that, namely, for the Federal supervision of interstate railways, and of interstate commerce generally, together with that for tariff revision. Having stolen the Democratic thunder by his advocacy of Federal supervision of interstate railways, and of interstate commerce, Mr. Roosevelt remained the cloud-compelling Zeus, and kept his place upon the summit of Olympus. It is, in other words, our opinion that the contest of 1904 did not turn upon platforms at all, but solely upon the vote-getting qualifications of the candidates, and, naturally, as Chief-Judge Parker was comparatively little known, and may possibly have lacked Mr. Roosevelt's magnetic personality, he had to succumb.

To which of the great sections of the Republic should the Democrats now turn for a candidate? Nebraska and some other Western States declare that we ought to put forward William J. Bryan for a third time. We have never questioned the ability or the patriotism of the eminent Nebraskan. We believe that, if elevated to the White House, and loaded with a sense of tremendous responsibilities, he would evince sobriety and caution, sagacity and foresight. Neither have we ever seen cause to doubt his loyalty to Chief-Judge Parker, the nominee of Mr. Bryan's party in the last Presidential campaign. Traitors there unquestionably were among pretended Democrats; but William J. Bryan was not one of them. Can he, however, blame his brethren when they confess a superstitious fear that he was born under an unlucky star? Never

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the history of this country has an American citizen been elected Chief Magistrate who twice previously had been a candidate for that great office, and twice had been defeated. Only thrice in our annals has a man who had even been *once* defeated been renominated and elected. We refer, of course, to Jefferson, to Jackson, and to Cleveland. The only other man whom Western Democrats would be at all likely to propose is Governor Folk of Missouri. He is relatively a young man, little more than eligible, in respect of age, for the Presidency, if we judge by precedents as well as by the letter of the Constitution. His career, which promises great distinction, has but begun. He, if any man, can afford to wait. As for the States east of the Mississippi and north of the Potomac, they present at the hour when we write no man whom the national Democracy would be at all likely to nominate. It is improbable that Mr. Hearst would even come forward as a candidate before the next Democratic National Convention, unless he should have been successful in obtaining the Governorship of New York. Mr. George B. McClellan has solemnly declared that he will accept a nomination for no other office, so long as he is Mayor of New York City. It is possible that a Democrat may be chosen this year Governor of Pennsylvania, but there is reason to fear that this State would still prove insuperably Republican in a Presidential year. We may add that no Pennsylvania Democrat can be said to have a national reputation. We should next point out that the day is distant when either the Democrats or the Republicans will take a nominee for the Presidency from the States west of the Rocky Mountains. That section has yet much to gain in respect of population before it can pretend to such an honor.

There remains the section south of the Potomac and the Ohio, which is composed of former slaveholding States. The Democratic leaders of that section have hitherto deemed it inexpedient to press upon Democratic National Conventions the nomination of a Southern man. There is nothing new about this belief in a Southerner's unavailability. It prevailed for many years before the Civil War. James K. Polk was the last Southerner nominated by a Democratic National Convention for the Presidency. The Whigs, for reasons that we cannot pause to enumerate here, did not concur in the opinion that a Southern man was unavailable. They twice nominated Henry Clay, a representative

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Kentucky; and, on one of the only two occasions when they were successful, they nominated Zachary Taylor of Louisiana. Is it any longer true that the nomination of a son of the South is inexpedient? Is it not a fact that all Northern Democrats, all Independents, and many large-minded Republicans, are convinced that the time has come to make a Southern man Chief Magistrate? Must we not acknowledge that the South, although nominally restored to the full privileges of States in the Union when she was permitted to send Senators and Representatives to Congress, is still partially disfranchised so long as her sons are debarred from the highest honor in the gift of the Republic? Shall we ever witness a veritable union—not of force and law, but of hearts—until, with the cordial concurrence of a large part of the North, a Southern man becomes Chief Magistrate? When a Southern man takes possession of the White House, then indeed will the white flowers of concord and mutual affection bloom above our battle-fields, and the last drop of bitterness be purged from the sad memories of fraternal warfare. Then, indeed, will peace smile upon the land, and equity lift its head triumphant. We profess in the North to have forgiven the South, but not yet can we claim to have brought forth fruits meet for forgiveness. They profess in the South—and they proved in 1898 that the profession was sincere—to have accepted accomplished facts, and to have acquiesced loyally in a Union which they failed to subvert. Their recognition deserves acknowledgment, and their loyalty reward. That reward can only take one adequate, one convincing, one decisive form—the elevation of a Southern man to the Presidency of the United States.

III.

No observant and fair-minded Northerner will deny the existence of an abundance of Presidential timber in the South. For fashioning the ribs of the Ship of State, Georgia pine is as well fitted as the cedar of Maine. It is not true that the States, once Confederate, have lost the breed of statesmen that once dominated the Commonwealth. We could name many a Democratic Senator to-day, and more than one Democratic Representative, who, in respect of political experience, political insight and political prescience, measures fully up to the standard of Chief Magistrate. There are Senator Morgan of Alabama, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senator Pettus of the same State, and, if some persons perchance should deem them disqualified by age, there are Senator Daniel of Virginia, and Senator Bailey of Texas, than whom no men in the Senate are more respected on the score of knowledge, judgment and the power of lucid, forceful exposition. May it not, however, be true that these distinguished Southern legislators, by the very reason of their prolonged prominence in public life, and of their strenuous and gallant upholding of the interests of their section, are ill calculated to allay lingering prejudices that ought to be extinct, and to quench the last flickering embers of sectional animosities, which it is a shame to keep alive?

We must remember that the question of nominating a Southern man for the Presidency is complicated with the imperative necessity that the first *post-bellum* Southern Administration shall be memorably successful. If the first Southern Administration should prove a failure, or only a half-success, it is much to be feared that there would never be another, so vast and so rapidly increasing is the numerical preponderance of the North. To insure such success, it is indispensable that the temper of the Republicans, if beaten in 1908, shall be resigned and acquiescent, not angry, vindictive and defiant. In other words, if a Southern President is to leave behind him a bright record of constructive statesmanship and useful legislation, he must have the good will, if not the active support, of the whole country, and such good will is only to be gained from a conviction, deep implanted at the North, as well as at the South, that both sections can count upon his sympathy, and, above all, upon that intimate acquaintance without which sympathy is fruitless.

We probably will be permitted to assert without contradiction that such all-embracing sympathy, such intimate and comprehensive acquaintance with the views, wishes and interests of all sections of the Republic is not possessed at the present juncture by any eminent Southern statesman. No veteran Southern statesman would claim it, we think, though we are sure that more than one of them sincerely regrets the lack of it. Is it necessary, however, that the Democracy, in its search for a worthy and a promising candidate for the Presidency, should confine itself to men who have spent the best part of their lives in the political arena? In this country political parties that have coveted success have not always circumscribed thus narrowly their field of selection. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was not, of course, his brief and almost speechless legislative experience in the Virginia Assembly, but his priceless military services, culminating in the capture of Cornwallis, which caused Washington in 1788 to receive every electoral vote for the Presidency. It was not his civil record in Tennessee, but the victory of New Orleans, that carried Andrew Jackson to the White House in 1828. It was not the fact that he had been Governor of Indiana Territory, and a member of both Houses of Congress, but the fact that he had triumphed at Tippecanoe, and, in the War of 1812, had beaten British soldiers under Proctor, and totally routed them in the Battle of the Thames, that caused the country to go "hell-bent" for William Henry Harrison in 1840. It was the battles of Palo Alto, of Resaca de la Palma and of Buena Vista that made Zachary Taylor Chief Magistrate, although he was asserted and believed never to have voted in his life. Not a few well-informed persons are convinced that, had the Republicans in 1868 put forward a typical representative of the Thaddeus Stevens faction, and had the Democratic National Convention nominated, as it was on the verge of doing, Chief-Justice Chase, the latter, sure as he was of Horace Greeley's zealous support, would have had a fair chance of securing a majority of the Presidential electors. If the Republicans were overwhelmingly successful that year at the ballot-box, it was because their choice fell on the man who hailed from Appomattox, though he had not voted for years, and though his latest vote is alleged to have been cast for a Democratic ticket.

Nor have party managers in the United States always confined themselves to the army, when, turning away for the moment from professional politicians, they have discussed or agreed upon the selection of a candidate from some other field of public usefulness. We can see in retrospect that, if the Republican National Convention in 1856 had followed the advice of Thaddeus Stevens, not yet discredited by headlong partisanship, and had nominated Justice McLean of the United States Supreme Court, they would probably have carried Pennsylvania, and, in all likelihood, have gained a majority of the electoral votes. In 1904, the Democracy conferred a nomination for the Presidency on the Chief Justice of the New York Court of Appeals, and, as has been already intimated, there is but little doubt that, after his memorable telegram to the St. Louis Convention, Chief-Judge Parker would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been elected had he not been pitted against a popular idol. He would have beaten with the utmost ease a Republican competitor of the Hanna type.

IV.

Is it only in the legislative arena, in the army or in the judiciary that great political parties must seek a name to conjure with in contests for the Presidency? Is it true that, as things are now, the intellect of the nation flows solely or mainly through those channels? Has not industry its generals, its commanders-in-chief, its conquerors? If brains were the only prerequisite, would not the creator of a transcontinental railroad, the imparter of prodigious development to the nation's natural resources, the successful consummator of such an enterprise as the Panama Canal, deserve the suffrages of his fellow citizens for the highest post at their disposal? There was a time when a large part of the American people would have answered the question in the affirmative, for in 1812 they gave no fewer than eighty-nine electoral votes to De Witt Clinton, who was already advocating the great undertaking which he was ultimately to accomplish, the construction of the Erie Canal. It is possibly true, however, that, in our day, owing to the inimical relations of labor and capital, a victor in the field of industrial evolution, however qualified he might be on the score of intellectual worth and of services to the country, would be unavailable as a candidate, if considered from the view-point of his vote-getting ability. For the moment, therefore, the triumphant organizers of production and transportation, who, by sheer dint of mental energy, have amassed colossal fortunes, may be eliminated from the list of available nominees.

There remains a field of activity and usefulness the importance of which to the nation cannot be overestimated; nor will any fair-minded man dispute that the eminent and fruitful workers in that field may challenge the highest office in the gift of the American people on the score of merit and of availability. We refer, of course, to the victors in the vast and inestimable department of public instruction; to the great captains of the higher education. The designation of such men for distinguished functions under the Federal Government is by no means unprecedented. George Bancroft had been a college tutor and a schoolmaster, and he left incomplete his famous "History of the United States," to become Secretary of the Navy in the Polk Administration, and, subsequently, he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was sent to represent his country in London and in Berlin. Edward Everett, after the death of Daniel Webster, left the Presidency of Harvard College to become Secretary of State. Mr. Andrew D. White, the former President of Cornell University, has more than once been invited to occupy the highest posts in the nation's diplomatic service. No one has ever disputed that the statesmanlike duties assumed by these organizers, directors and inspirers of the higher education were admirably discharged. Why, then, should not the Democratic party in 1908, when seeking a nominee for the Presidency who will not only deserve but command success, turn its eyes in the same promising direction? Is it not quite possible to find among the Presidents of honored universities a man richly qualified for the headship of the Federal Government by great natural ability, by long and distinguished professional experience, by the illuminating and invigorating trend of his studies, by his exceptional popularity and by his unique power of securing the confidence, the sympathy and the support of all sections of the Union?

V.

We submit that such a man may be found in Woodrow Wilson of Virginia, now President of Princeton University. Woodrow Wilson, we may briefly recall, was born at Stanton, Virginia, on December 28, 1856, and is not yet, therefore, fifty years of age. He was graduated from Princeton in 1879, and, after studying law in the University of Virginia, he began the practice of his profession in Atlanta, Georgia. The lady whom he married in 1885 was a native of Savannah. Impelled by his personal tastes and aptitudes to transfer his energies from the law to the field of the higher education, he became successively a Professor of History and Political Economy in Bryn Mawr College and Wesleyan University, then a Professor of Jurisprudence and Politics at Princeton; and, finally, since August, 1902, he has been the President of the last-named University. He is held in the highest honor by every Princeton graduate and by all university men. He is known to a multitude of thoughtful readers as the author of "Congressional Government: a Study of American Politics"; of "The State: Elements of Historical and Practical Politics"; of "Division and Reunion, 1829-1889"; of a life of "George Washington"; and, finally, of an elaborate and comprehensive "History of the American People." As was pointed out the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other day in "Harper's Weekly," no one who reads understandingly his record of his country's extraordinary growth, which in his "History of the American People" seemed to flow with such apparent ease from his pen, can fail to be impressed with the belief that he is, by instinct and education, a statesman. The grasp of fundamental principles, the seemingly intuitive application of primary truths to changing conditions, the breadth of thought and the cogency of reasoning exemplified in the pages of that work, were rightly acclaimed in "Harper's Weekly" as clear evidences of sagacity, worthy of Virginia's noblest traditions, as was also the eloquent appeal addressed last year by President Wilson to his brethren of the South, in which he called upon them to rise manfully from the ashes of prejudice and lethargy, and come back into their own. We ourselves cordially concur—and we believe that far-sighted Democrats all over the country will concur also—with "Harper's Weekly" in the conviction that the country needs relief from the strenuous and histrionic methods of Federal administration now exemplified in the White House. It needs a man who is a genuine historical scholar, and who has conclusively proved himself a competent executive. It needs a statesman of breadth, depth and exceptional sagacity; an idealist, who, at the same time, shall be exceptionally sane. It needs a man who, although steeped in Jeffersonian teachings, can be trusted at a given crisis to ask, not what Jefferson *did* a century ago, but what Jefferson would do *now*. It needs a man whose nomination would be a recognition of the South, which the South nobly deserves, and whose election would be a decisive proof of the full restoration of the Union. Such, unquestionably, is the man whom the country urgently requires, by whatever political party he may chance to be brought forward. Such a man is Woodrow Wilson of Virginia and New Jersey. We add that he is a Democrat, and of course a tariff-revisionist. In a word he meets all the exigencies of the situation.

A JEFFERSONIAN DEMOCRAT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIFE-INSURANCE LEGISLATION.

BY PAUL MORTON, PRESIDENT OF THE EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES, AND D. P. KINGSLEY, VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

I.—PROTECT THE POLICY-HOLDERS.

THE life-insurance companies, at the present moment, are like great passenger-steamers that have encountered heavy weather, and whose passengers have become apprehensive, notwithstanding the fact that it has been clearly shown that the vessels are absolutely seaworthy. The best counsel, therefore, that I can give these passengers is to advise them to stick by the ship.

There has been too much racing, but that has been stopped. Charts may have been disregarded, but every ship is now in its right course.

It is true that laws must be passed providing for more thorough inspection. Compasses must be looked to. Anchors and cables must be tested. Charts must be carefully followed. But the comfort and convenience, and, above all, the safety of the passengers must not be threatened by well-meaning but injudicious legislation.

The policy-holders of a life-insurance company, however, are not in all respects like passengers, for they are the owners of the ships on which they sail. Just here, reformers and critics and legislators and the public at large are in most danger of going astray. The policy-holders of a life-insurance company are not merely customers; they have a proprietary interest (whether the company has a capital, or is organized on the mutual plan). The policy-holders constitute the company; contribute the money with which the business is conducted; pay their own losses; reap the profits of good management, and suffer the penalties of mis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

management. It does not follow from this that the business must be conducted by the policy-holders themselves; but it does follow that those who are charged with that responsibility shall protect the interests of the owners.

SECURITY IS ESSENTIAL, BUT INVESTMENTS SHOULD YIELD AN INCOME.

It goes without saying that no life-insurance company should be permitted to embark in speculative ventures, or to place the money of its policy-holders in anything but gilt-edged securities; but, in avoiding danger in one direction, care must be taken that we are not injured in some other direction. This whole question is of far greater importance than the superficial observer imagines. While it is essential that the assets of an insurance company shall not be imperilled, it is equally important that investments shall yield an adequate return. Few persons realize the fact that the actuaries, in computing premium charges, credit policy-holders in advance with the interest which their premiums are expected to earn. Hence, if the companies should be limited hereafter to investments that yield less than this credit, there will be, to that extent, a deficiency.

Or, if a company that has many millions of dollars invested in safe securities should be forced by law to throw them on the market, the resulting impairment might be greater than the loss from a mere shrinkage in interest; for a part of the principal might have to be sacrificed. Moreover, it might be difficult to find investments as safe or as valuable to replace them.

The assets of the life-insurance companies of the United States form an enormous aggregate; and, if investments are restricted within too narrow a limit, the authorized class of securities will command a fancy price (as in the case of Government bonds), and policy-holders will have to content themselves with investments yielding an inadequate return.

And if a retroactive law, forcing the life-insurance companies to undo the work of years, should be passed, would not a dangerous and far-reaching precedent be established? Would not such a law pave the way for retroactive legislation regarding the investments of railroads, banks and other corporations?

It is one thing to decide upon future action, and another to reach back into the past and make even desirable readjustments;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for in the latter case there is danger of doing more harm than the good aimed at can possibly accomplish.

If any truth has been demonstrated by the investigation of the Legislative Committee, it is that the prominent insurance companies have great financial strength. And that strength is due to the good character of the securities in which their funds have been invested.

THE VALUE OF SURPLUS.

It has been said that the large surplus accumulations of many of the companies have resulted in careless and extravagant administration, and that, therefore, the law should stipulate that no company shall be permitted hereafter to hold more than a very narrow margin of surplus. But permanent security is the consideration of first importance, and no greater calamity could fall upon policy-holders than the passage of a law which might imperil the solvency of any one of these great institutions.

It is the chief glory of a bank or trust company that it has abundant surplus strength; and the market value of its shares depends largely upon the amount of the surplus held. And, although the policy-holder in an insurance company is in a sense a depositor, his interests are also those of a shareholder, or proprietor.

AGENTS' COMMISSIONS.

Strict economy is now the watchword of the insurance companies; and it is universally agreed that the compensation of agents must be reduced, but coupled with that resolve is the determination that more care than ever before shall be exercised in the selection of agents. And, if men of standing and responsibility and integrity are to represent the companies hereafter, they must receive fair remuneration.

THE INSURANCE COMPANIES HAVE BENEFITED THE STATE.

New York is the financial centre of the Western Hemisphere, and may be classed with London, Paris and Berlin. The industry of the New York companies, the funds gathered together by them from all over the country, have had much to do with this development. Therefore, in remedying the evils that have crept

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into the business, the New York Legislature will do well to view the question broadly; for it is easier to pull down than to build up, and the insurance companies of New York are surrounded by citizens of other States who would glory in their discomfiture, and would be eager to turn to advantage any blunders committed by them, no matter how praiseworthy their motives might be. In the mad rush for preeminence, excesses have been committed; but, in ridding ourselves of the evil, let us be careful not to destroy the good.

There are multitudes of companies of other States that have found the competition of the companies of New York State hard to contend against. If that competition should be removed, they might be tempted in turn to abandon their former conservatism. The New York companies, moreover, have armies of trained men in the field. These men are working, not only within the borders of New York State, but in every other State. They are abundantly able to make a living if their companies are able to meet the public demand; but those who are interested in the welfare of the New York companies must take heed lest these trained men become disheartened and desert to the companies of other States. A twofold injury would result: not only would business be lost, but the extensive plants which have been built up by the great New York companies would be idle; an expensive burden would then be saddled upon policy-holders, and dividends would dwindle.

DEFERRED DIVIDENDS.

Deferred-dividend policies have been criticised, and valid objections have been advanced, but these objections do not relate to the plan itself. They relate simply to the manner in which that branch of the business has been conducted.

Dividends have been disappointing, but this disappointment has not been confined to the dividends on deferred-dividend policies; the dividends on annual-dividend policies have been equally unsatisfactory. The companies and the agents have been blamed for this state of affairs; the companies, because early estimates were too high; the agents, because they have been accused of making exaggerated predictions. But the decline in dividends during recent years has been due primarily to two altogether different causes,—namely, (1) shrinkage in the income on invest-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments; and (2) the large surrender values and expensive benefits granted to policy-holders under modern contracts of insurance. These surrender values and benefits, which were not granted formerly, have used up part of the surplus which might otherwise have been distributed in dividends. Otherwise, dividends to-day would correspond more closely with the predictions made when the policies were issued. Hereafter no predictions must be made as to the amount of future dividends; and policy-holders must understand that expensive privileges granted during the period of accumulation will necessarily reduce the amount distributable in dividends at the end of the period. If all this is made plain, a plan of insurance may be maintained which has one characteristic impossible under any other plan—a characteristic which seems to have been overlooked by critics and reformers. I refer to the circumstance that, under the deferred-dividend plan, the burden is lightened for every policy-holder who exhibits exceptional vitality, and, therefore, becomes a paying member of the organization—the one who contributes most towards the payment of death claims. The whole fabric of life-insurance is based on the theory that those who live long must contribute most of the money needed to pay the insurance on the lives of those who die first. In the event of early death, the return to the beneficiary, as compared with the amount paid in premiums, is enormous in every case; and this is as it should be. But the manner in which *dividends* shall be paid is discretionary. It is true that the company has no right to forfeit the dividend of one policy-holder and pay it to another; nor is such the practice under the deferred-dividend plan, although that has been charged. The deferred-dividend plan simply offers a contract under which the applicant voluntarily agrees that in the event of premature death he will relinquish all claim to a participation in profits, if, *in consideration of that waiver,* it is understood that, if his life is prolonged, his dividend shall be increased by the profits relinquished by those who die prematurely. Surely, the man who pays premiums for twenty years, or longer, is entitled to as much relief as his fellow members can furnish, provided no one is victimized thereby.

But, whatever may be the course of wisdom regarding the future, it is to be hoped that nothing may be done to disturb the minds of the hundreds of thousands of people throughout the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States whose existing policies are on the deferred-dividend plan. The manner in which dividends are distributed is of minor importance; and every one of these policy-holders (if his insurance is in a solvent company) has a good asset, which has been growing in value from the day the investment was made.

To all such I commend the following advice of Senator Armstrong, Chairman of the Legislative Committee:

"I am asked for a brief message to policy-holders. . . . Do not allow your policies to lapse. . . . Those who suffer their policies to lapse will lose the benefit of what has been done already, as well as what we hope to accomplish. No such sacrifice ought to be made by policy-holders."

In conclusion, let me say that it is my firm belief that, from this time on, it will be the honest endeavor of the officers and directors of all the reputable companies in New York to conduct their affairs in such a manner as to merit the approbation of every citizen of the State. I know of no opposition to wise legislation. The courage and sincerity and thoroughness with which the Legislative Committee has conducted its investigation deserve the highest commendation, and all that I, or any other conscientious life-insurance manager, can ask is that the laws to be enacted shall be reasonable and beneficial, and that policy-holders shall be protected and not injured. And the point which demands most emphasis in this connection is that, if the life-insurance companies are injured, even inadvertently, the policy-holders are the ones who will be damaged thereby.

PAUL MORTON.

II.—SAFEGUARD THE COMPANIES.

LIFE-INSURANCE as practised in the United States, and especially by the companies of New York State, has had, within fifteen years, a most astonishing growth. At least three companies chartered by the State of New York have become international in their character, and one of the three holds at the present time a concession to do business, and is actually doing business, in every important country of Europe, in South America, in South Africa, in Australia, in China and in India.

The conduct of this business, or rather the condition of it,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was referred to a Committee created by the New York State Legislature, and the sitting Legislature of the State has before it the findings and recommendations of that Committee, based on an inquiry which extended from the early part of September to the close of December, 1905.

Much of the legislation proposed has received the cordial support of all life-insurance men: for example, the provisions for publicity; the prohibition of political contributions; the regulation of lobbying; the prohibition of rebates; making the policy the entire contract between the company and the insured, etc. But with some of the other proposals all life-insurance men take issue, and over a few there is difference of opinion.

One section of the proposed legislation has met the united opposition, in one form or another, of all companies, whether chartered by New York or chartered elsewhere. This section undertakes to limit the amount of money that may be paid for securing new insurance in any year. The opposition unites in saying that the theory of this section is unworkable, that its provisions are impracticable and destructive, that it will substantially exterminate the existing agency organization of any company operating hereafter in New York. There is no resisting the conclusion that the Committee must have decided, before it prepared this section, that the business of the New York companies, and, broadly speaking, the life-insurance business of the State, ought, for some good and sufficient public reason, to be curtailed, if not substantially brought to a standstill.

In another section, the Committee goes further; and, notwithstanding the provision already referred to, which would limit the cost of the yearly output of the companies, provision is made for an arbitrary limit on the amount of that output in any year. To the impartial observer, this suggests even more strongly a determination in the Committee's mind to stop the growth of the business in New York. It was obviously decided that if any company, notwithstanding what for the sake of argument we will call sound limitations on the cost of new business, succeeded in doing business, then that company should only be permitted to do, with relation to what it has previously done, a restricted amount. This, assuredly, is strange doctrine to be found in the statutes of any State. That the law should limit success, that it should say to a man or a corporation, doing an honest business

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

honorably, "Thus far and no farther," is a new doctrine, and one that will not be generally welcomed.

In another section, the Committee undertakes to recite the exact phraseology of the life-insurance contract hereafter to be used in New York; and, in still another, specific prohibition is laid on companies doing business in the State and on the citizens of the State, which forbids the issue of contracts providing for a distribution of dividends on any plan except what is known as the "annual-dividend" plan. This is pure paternalism and sumptuary legislation.

In still another paragraph, the Committee lays down a programme with regard to the future control of the two great mutual companies of New York city, which cannot be called anything less than revolutionary, and which even the sharpest critics of the conduct of the companies must hesitate to endorse. In a word, provision is made for the abrupt termination of the tenure of office, not of a portion, but of all, of the trustees of these two companies on the 15th of November next. An election law is provided, and the control of the companies is obviously to be forced, if not into, then very near, the arena of politics. No one can object to an arrangement by which the policy-holders may vote, and vote easily; but any arrangement which would shift suddenly the control of nearly nine hundred million dollars of accumulated savings from one set of trustees to another can be justified only because of the clear existence of the gravest peril to the assets if that were not done.

It is not easy, even to one's own satisfaction, to analyze the condition of mind which, after four months of most strenuous labor, made the Committee feel that its duty required it to offer such suggestions as these. To me, it seems that the Committee, listening day by day to a recital of mistakes and faults and errors of judgment, and, in some cases, of actual dishonesty, became so impressed or overwhelmed with the mass of material which was cast upon it, that it was unable to see out, unable to get and keep a broad grasp on what life-insurance really is and what it really needs.

The three great New York companies alone have in force throughout the world insurance amounting to, approximately, five thousand million dollars. Admitting that life-insurance is good for the individual and the State—and it is difficult to find

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a man in these days who will refuse to make that admission—it is not easy even to approximate the value of what these three companies have done, not merely in New York State and in the United States, but throughout the world. Existing insurance is so valuable, viewed from an economic standpoint, that any suggestion which looks towards its regulation should always be very carefully considered, and any suggestion which involves the possibility of its serious injury ought not to be even entertained. These companies represent about the earliest expression, on a large scale, of a definite out-working of the theory of cooperation. They have been making the experiment boldly and ably, and, upon the whole, honestly. This I say notwithstanding all the evidence brought out before the Legislative Committee, and notwithstanding the need of drastic correctives.

There is a very sure and simple way to arrive at the conclusion that the business of life-insurance, as practised by our great companies, has been, on the whole, honestly managed. Each of the three companies most under criticism of late, has been submitted, not only to this legislative inquisition, but, in addition, to all sorts and varieties of examinations by the State, by groups of States, and by chartered and certified accountants of known reputation. Out of this whirlwind of inquiry, the companies have emerged abundantly solvent, and abundantly able to carry out every contract on their books. This condition is a fact that any one can verify. It shows conclusively that the presentation made before the Armstrong Committee of errors and faults and wrong-doing proven, did not reach to the body of any one of the companies. Having passed through this fiery ordeal, and having shown itself to be thoroughly sound, it is not strange that life-insurance now stands somewhat appalled at the suggestion that the laws of the State should be so amended that the business will be seriously crippled, its working organization destroyed, and an asset of great value to the policy-holders arbitrarily dissipated.

Some of the proposals of the Armstrong Committee, in the interests of the State, should be radically modified. The expense of getting business may be a proper subject for regulation, but that style of legislation is always dangerous, and any regulations adopted should, above all things, aim at securing publicity and insuring the operation of competition in the interests of the pub-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lic. Having established publicity, and a sensible regulation of first year's cost, any order which says that a reputable business, honestly conducted, shall limit itself in any one year in what it shall do, is abhorrent to every instinct of the American citizen. Therefore, any law arbitrarily limiting the annual output of these companies is worse than a mistake.

Again, the citizen should be allowed to take any style of insurance he sees fit, provided the contract is an honest contract; therefore, no one should be denied the right to buy a policy with "dividends," so called, payable at the end of each year. Neither should he be denied the right to make a contract with dividends payable at the end of five, ten, fifteen or twenty years. Each style of contract has its advantages, and to deny a man the right to buy what he wants is paternalism indeed.

To subject the present enormous savings in the two great mutual companies to the grave risk and danger of a sudden and violent shift of the entire Board of Trustees, is a proposition so radical and so revolutionary that it is rather surprising it should be so seriously entertained in any legislative body in the United States.

The Legislative Committee, from a moral standpoint, has already done an enormous amount of good, not only to life-insurance, but to all business. It is quite possible, however, by forcing through the measures discussed here, to do an injury to life-insurance which will more than offset all the good accomplished. The injury, as I view it, would be temporary only, although it might be serious. The good sense of the people of the State of New York will, after a little, reassert itself; and any unfair treatment given to a business which has had a useful existence of over two hundred years, and has, upon the whole, been conducted brilliantly and successfully by the companies of New York State, will certainly and speedily be remedied.

D. P. KINGSLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TREATY-MAKING POWER OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE SENATE.

BY AUGUSTUS O. BACON, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM GEORGIA.

By the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, the range of the treaty-making power is practically without limitation and may extend to any subject, or agreement relative thereto, not forbidden by the Constitution, and not inconsistent with the nature of the Government itself and that of the state.* The wide scope of this power may, in its practical exercise, reach to every international concern and relation, from the least significant to the other extreme, such as the absorption of other countries or as alliances offensive and defensive—and the latter when in circumstances leading to inevitable war. Without transcending the bounds set for it by law, its rash or inconsiderate use may seriously impair the settled conservative policies of the United States; and in extreme cases such use may involve the country in disaster.

The exercise of this stupendous power, second to none under the Government, is vested in the President and the Senate. By some it is claimed that in this there has been conferred upon the President a vastly preponderating power, and that to the Senate there only belongs a comparatively insignificant and altogether limited function. It is claimed, on the contrary, by others that, in the exercise of the treaty-making power, the Senate possesses, under the Constitution, equal dignity, equal power and equal responsibility with the President.

In the process of making treaties, it is ordinarily true in practice that the work done by the President and that done by the Senate are separate and distinct, each from the other. In other words, it generally happens that the President does one part of

* 133 U. S., 267.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the work and the Senate another and a distinct part. The conception of a treaty is, in such ordinary cases, with the President; and also, in the general practice and experience, the formulation of its provisions, the suggestion to and discussion and agreement with the foreign Power, are the sole work of the President; and this, in common phrase, is termed the "negotiation of a treaty." On the other hand, when a treaty is thus agreed upon, and subsequently submitted to the Senate, the function of the Senate in such case is, in ordinary practice, confined, when the treaty is approved, to its ratification with or without amendment, or, when disapproved, to its rejection.

Out of this division of the work, thus in practice generally occurring, has naturally grown the understanding, among those who have not made careful investigation, that the Constitution in its distribution of powers has divided them in this manner between the President and the Senate respectively. Upon this is based the contention of some that the work of negotiation includes not only the subject and terms, but every phase of a proposed treaty from its inception to its submission to the Senate for ratification or rejection; that the negotiation, in this broad sense, up to the point of submission to the Senate, is the exclusive prerogative of the President, and that for the Senate prior to the time of such submission to attempt to participate in the work—either by suggestion of what should or should not be done relative to a proposed treaty, or by making any inquiry of the President concerning the same or relative to any pending or proposed negotiation of whatever character or gravity—is an unwarranted intrusion. From this is deduced the conclusion that no jurisdiction or responsibility attaches to the Senate, and no duty begins, until the proposed treaty is submitted to it, and that, except as to the power of amendment, the entire function of the Senate consists in the ratification or rejection of the proposed treaty.

Out of this claim of exclusive jurisdiction and power in the President arises the interesting and vitally important question, What are, under the Constitution, the relative and respective powers and duties of the President and of the Senate in the making of treaties?

Is the prerogative of the Senate narrowly limited to the giving of a perfunctory "yes" or "no" to a completed negotiation when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

submitted to it by the President, or has the Senate, as the constitutional adviser of the President, a wider prerogative, to be exercised when the occasion demands, extending, with its responsibility, from the inception of a proposed treaty through all its stages, including its negotiation, to its final ratification or rejection? The gravity of this question will be realized when it is remembered that treaties which may thus cover every international subject, however grave and far-reaching, and every question which can arise for settlement and disposition between this and a foreign country, are, when made, declared by the Constitution to be "the supreme law of the land."

The reply to the question propounded must be found in the correct construction of the clause of the Constitution prescribing how treaties shall be made. Fortunately, so much of the Constitution as relates to this subject is within a very small compass. It is found in the second paragraph of the second section of Article II, where, in speaking of the President, it says:

> "He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided that two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

That is all there is in the Constitution as to the power of the President to make treaties and the right and the power of the Senate to participate. So far as the right to suggest a treaty to a foreign Power is concerned, or to receive suggestions from a foreign Power, it naturally pertains to the President as the one to hold direct communication with a foreign Power. He is styled by Chancellor Kent, and other eminent law writers, the "constitutional organ of communication with foreign Powers." But this function by no means includes the entire work of negotiation, and the contention is far overstrained that alone in the brain of the President, alone in his suggestion and deliberation, alone in his judgment, must be determined, evolved and shaped the great international policies and measures which, if they are subsequently embodied in a treaty, must, by the terms of the Constitution, be "the supreme law of the land." Such contention in no wise harmonizes with the design of the Constitution, which in no particular confides to one man alone the exercise of any great power, save in the single function of the execution of the laws.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Constitution, in the clause above quoted, does not divide the powers conferred upon the President and the Senate respectively into two parts, so that the term "to make" should be construed to mean, in the first division, "to negotiate," and, in another division, "to consent," thus conferring the one upon the President and the other upon the Senate. It is one indivisible power—"to make"; and in the entire power "to make" the Senate is given full participation in advising and consenting. "To make" embraces the entire substantial work, including the negotiation; and it may be remarked that the Senate actively engages in the work of negotiation when it makes an amendment to a proposed treaty, which amendment is to be submitted by the President to the foreign Power for its consideration and approval. Such amendments are made by the Senate at every session. An amendment thus made by the Senate, to be by the President submitted to the foreign Power for its consideration and action, is as strictly a part of the "negotiation" as is any part of the proposed treaty originally submitted by the President to the foreign Power.

The contention that the power of the President includes everything up to the time of the submission of the proposed treaty to the Senate might be sustained if the language of the Constitution were that:

> "The President of the United States shall have power to negotiate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 'to make' treaties."

Such phraseology would indicate two separate functions. It would indicate a first division of the duty, "to negotiate," the jurisdiction of which would be confined entirely and solely to the President; and the second division, "to make," one in which the President and the Senate together should act.

But the language of the Constitution is: "He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties."

It is significant that the words "advice and consent" precede the words "to make." The phraseology of the clause plainly indicates, not that the Senate shall be limited to saying "yes" or "no" to a perfected and finished work when presented to it by the President, but rather that there shall be the assistance of the Senate, the advice and cooperation of the Senate, in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

determination as to the propriety and policies of proposed treaties and also as to the terms and provisions they shall contain. The omission of the words "to negotiate" was not accidental. There was design in not conferring a separate and distinct power on the President. So far is it from being accidental, that the words used by the framers of the Constitution in the very next clause, really only divided from the clause in question by a semicolon, prove that in constructing this paragraph they were weighing carefully the language when they conferred power upon the President of the United States in the making of treaties. The two clauses of the same paragraph are as follows:

"He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided that two-thirds of the Senators present concur"

Then follows the semicolon. Then the language proceeds:

"and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, etc."

In the latter clause, it was evidently the distinct purpose to divide the powers, and to confer in the first part of that division an exclusive function and jurisdiction upon the President of the United States—to wit, "to nominate." It is equally evident that the function of the Senate was limited to advising and consenting to the nomination previously made by the President in the discharge of a function and of a jurisdiction of nominating exclusively confined to him. But, on the contrary, there is in the former clause as to treaties no such division. The sole power is "to make" treaties, and in this entire undivided function the advice and consent of the Senate are prescribed as a part thereof.

If the Senate were intended to participate only after treaties were formulated and agreed upon with foreign Powers, only the word "consent" would have been used in this section. The word "advice" would not have been used. We do not advise men after they have made up their minds and after they have acted. We advise men while they are considering, while they are deliberating, before they have determined and before they have acted.

Not only do the letter and spirit of the Constitution, and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

history of the treaty-making power as well, deny the proposition that the duty and jurisdiction of the Senate do not begin until the President sends the treaty to the Senate, but the practice of the Government, from its foundation to the present time, also denies it. Washington during his administration, before negotiating treaties, visited the Senate to advise with it on the policy and propriety of making such treaties. He was the President of the Convention that framed the Constitution. He had heard all the debates in that Convention. He had, doubtless, conferred during all the months of its sitting with the delegates relative to the organization of the treaty-making power—a question, in the consideration of which the delegates, throughout the deliberations of the Convention, held most tenaciously to the preservation of the power of the States as represented in the Senate. He knew what the understanding and intentions were of the framers of the Constitution in this provision; and he conformed his practice when President to such understanding and intention. And that purpose of the Convention was most strongly emphasized when it required that, not only a majority, but two-thirds of the Senate should be necessary to assent to a treaty. Indeed, the importance of the Senate in the making of treaties was held in such esteem that a serious and determined effort was made to require two-thirds of the entire Senate to ratify a treaty, whether present or not. This fact is mentioned by Washington in a message of March 30th, 1796.

While that practice of personally visiting the Senate for consultation has been abandoned, the practice of consulting the Senate prior to making a treaty has not been abandoned by subsequent Presidents. Did space permit, many instances could be given in which Presidents have asked the advice of the Senate, as to the policy of making a treaty, prior to entering into negotiations concerning the same. These instances would include not only Washington, but the elder Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Van Buren, Polk, Taylor, Fillmore, Pierce, Buchanan, Lincoln, Grant and Arthur.

In addition to these formal submissions to the Senate for advice, instances are innumerable, up to the most recent date, of the President's asking the advice of individual Senators prior to the negotiation of a proposed treaty. It has also been the well-recognized and continuous practice of the Senate by resolution

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to inform the President that, in the opinion of the Senate, it would be advisable to negotiate a treaty to effect a stated purpose.

If the construction is correct that the Senate has no jurisdiction, no duty, no responsibility, until a treaty has been submitted to it by the President for ratification or rejection, then none of these Presidents had the right to ask the advice either of the Senate or of individual Senators; nor has the Senate had the right to advise the President as to the policy of negotiating any treaty for a stated purpose. On the contrary, such advice, when given by the Senate, would be a gratuitous intrusion upon the President's exclusive jurisdiction. But, so far from this being true, these numerous and long-continued precedents illustrate the correct construction of this clause of the Constitution. The law makes the Senate the adviser of the President in the making of a treaty through all its stages—not that it requires that, in every instance, the President shall have the advice and consent of the Senate, but that, in every instance, the President has the right to have it, and correspondingly, in every instance, the Senate has the right to offer it. It is a reciprocal right for a common benefit.

That is the relation. It is the right of the President to have; it is the right of the Senate to offer. It is no intrusion upon the right of the Senate, before the submission of a treaty and before it is asked whether or not it will ratify it, for the President to ask the advice of the Senate, and it is no intrusion on the part of the Senate to ask of the President information with reference to any treaty he proposes to make, and to advise as to the policy or impolicy of making it.

If the construction is correct which gives to the President exclusive jurisdiction and power, it matters not what may be the well-understood purpose of the Executive in negotiating a treaty or in sending delegates to a European political convention to settle European international questions, the Senate must be dumb until it receives a proposed treaty. It may be that the proceeding begun or proposed by the President tends inevitably to war. As stated by one of the commentators on the Constitution (Pomeroy), the President may "so conduct . . . the diplomatic negotiations with other governments, as to force war, as to compel another nation to take the initiative; and, that step once taken, the challenge cannot be refused."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Again, the Executive may, without even sending any proposed treaty to the Senate, continue to send delegates to European international political conferences, and thus in time practically destroy our recognition of the long-established doctrine of non-entanglement by us in such disputes. The sending of delegates from this Government to the Algeciras Conference is a case in point. It is known to all the world that that Conference was called to deal with an acute question between Germany and France which threatened war. All other questions which have been injected into it are mere shams and disguises to conceal the real purpose of the Conference. After our Government has taken an active part through our delegates in the Algeciras Conference, no proposed treaty may be submitted to the Senate. Nor is that all in sight. We are told in the press despatches that European questions concerning the Balkan States are again becoming acute; that there is great tension, and that another European war-cloud is gathering in the East. Doubtless, there will soon be another conference to deal with that situation. To that conference, according to the new doctrine, it will again be in order to send delegates from the United States. And after we have taken an active part in the deliberations of the conference, again no proposed treaty may be sent to the Senate. But a still wider field for our newly found diplomatic activities is opened by the events of the Algeciras Conference. The principle contended for by France is the right of domination in a foreign country by the nation possessing in that country the largest interest, either political, racial or other. With that principle conceded by the nations, Germany will not have been the loser; for it is not improbable that the day is not far distant when, with changing dynasties among her neighbors, she will invoke that principle in support of her claim of right to dominate both in Holland and Austria. And to the conferences which the assertion of those claims will require, the precedent of the Algeciras Conference, if controlling, will require delegates to be sent on the part of the United States. Although in each of these instances no treaty may be submitted to the Senate, nevertheless in participating in each of these conferences through our delegates, tremendous strides will have been taken in establishing precedents and in destroying the doctrine of an hundred years against entanglements in European international disputes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The history of the treaty-making clause of the Constitution has a marked pertinence in this discussion. We have the Madison Papers written by Mr. Madison, containing his report, taken down during the Convention, in which there is a detailed account of the entire proceedings, with a statement of every motion that was made, every paper that was submitted and a summary of everything that was said by every member of the Convention. That Convention was in session about four months; and from the beginning to the end of it—until very near the close—the consensus of opinion was that the Senate should be clothed with the exclusive right to make treaties. Not a draft of the Constitution was submitted which did not contain unqualified provision that the Senate and the Senate alone should make treaties. Mr. Hamilton was the one great advocate of central power; and, so far as I have been able to discover, the only one, up to the last days of the Convention, who so much as suggested the participation of the President in the making of treaties. His suggestion, which he said at the time he would not offer for action, was that it was something which the President should do "upon the advice and with the approbation of the Senate." If the Constitution had finally used precisely that language, there certainly could have been no question as to its contemplation that the advice would precede the approval. In no instance was there, during the entire Convention, even a suggestion by any one that the President alone should have power to make treaties.

On the contrary, this proposal by Hamilton was the only instance, till near the close of the Convention, of its being even suggested that the President should participate at all. Mr. Charles Pinckney, in the early stages of the Convention, submitted a complete draft of a proposed constitution, which formed the basis of that which was ultimately adopted. In Article VII of that draft were the words:

"The Senate shall have the sole and exclusive power . . . to make treaties."

All of the various proposed provisions of the Constitution were debated, and it was finally committed to a few learned and prominent men to shape up the various articles which had been substantially agreed upon. When this committee on detail reported to the Convention the proposed Constitution, this was still the language:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Article IX, sec. I. The Senate of the United States shall have power to make treaties."

In this last discussion, Mr. Madison made finally the suggestion: "That the Senate represented States alone, and that, for this as well as other obvious reasons, it was proper that the President should be an agent in treaties."

It was upon Mr. Madison's motion, based upon the proposition that the President should be "an agent in treaties," that the present provision in the Constitution was incorporated in it. This history of the clause certainly does not indicate an intention that the President should exercise an exclusive jurisdiction in the most important part of treaty-making, or that in it he should be "supreme"—a word which has recently often been used in the discussions as expressing the extent of the treaty-making power of the President. It is quite true that, after a proposed treaty has been ratified by the Senate, the President can put it in his pocket and refuse to exchange it with the foreign Power; but it is equally true that, when a proposed treaty is received by the Senate, it can bury it in its archives without considering it and without any action whatever. Such action by either would be unseemly, except for a sufficient and controlling reason. Neither has the right to capriciously disregard the functions of the other.

Of the treaty-making power, of the duty of the President, and of the duty of the Senate, it may properly be said that there is imposed by the Constitution a reciprocal and a common duty, one in which each has the advantage of the services of the other, one in which there can be no compulsion, one in which each can defeat the work of the other, one in which the cooperation and combination of the two, from the inception to the end, is necessary in order to comply fully with the intention and design of the Constitution-makers in this regard.

Ordinarily, in the making of treaties, it is not needful that the rule of constitutional law for which I contend should be invoked in practice. And, when it is invoked, there will doubtless be occasions when, by reason of the delicacy of a diplomatic situation, the President will reply that he does not consider it compatible with the public interests to give the Senate such information as may be requested—a suggestion of which fact by the President is always courteously acquiesced in by the Senate,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that without reference to the question whether the President has constitutionally the right thus to withhold information when asked for. But the reciprocal right and duty nevertheless exist, and in grave emergencies they should be exercised, and the effort thus to exercise them is not properly met by the denial of their existence. Much less is there warrant for resenting as an intrusion the attempt of the Senate to exercise such right and duty either by suggestion or by inquiry.

It is a salutary practice for the President to be advised by the Senate whether there should or should not be an attempt to make a treaty, or to interfere in any manner with the affairs of other nations. There are Senators who have been in office for a generation and whose advice and counsel would be valuable to any President, however learned and able and patriotic he might be. It has rarely happened that a President is superior, in either natural or acquired ability, to the average ability of the Senate. It has frequently happened that the President chosen has been without any experience in national public affairs. There may be at some time in the future an impulsive and strong-willed or even, possibly, a weak President. An election to the Presidency does not *ipso facto* endow one with all knowledge and all wisdom; and it is not an unreasonable suggestion that, in the aggregate of ninety Senators, many of them men of great capacity and of large experience, there is more of knowledge of public affairs, more of conservatism, more of correct judgment of the requirements of the public interests, than is possessed by any one man in the United States, whoever he may be.

AUGUSTUS O. BACON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TUSKEGEE: A RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT.

BY BOOKER T. WASHINGTON, PRINCIPAL OF THE TUSKEGEE NORMAL AND INDUSTRIAL INSTITUTE.

THE Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute celebrates this year on April 4, 5 and 6, its twenty-fifth birthday. As I look back at its humble beginnings, and its gradual growth into what it is, and the promise of what it shall be, it seems to me that one of its more important services has been to provide Negroes with an unusual opportunity to engage in the education and upbuilding of their own race. This school represents, in a large measure, the effort of the Negro race to help itself, and therein is the real significance of its work.

From the first, it has been the effort of the Tuskegee Institute to teach the lessons of self-help by furnishing an example. With this aim in view, the task of building up and maintaining the school has been largely entrusted to its own students. They have, in a large degree, made the bricks and erected the buildings. They have, for the most part, done the work of the farm, raised the provisions and cooked the food. The fact that they have done this under the direction of Negro teachers, with very little assistance from outside the school, has given them self-appreciation and self-reliance and an added respect for their race.

In saying this, I do not forget the debt that this school owes to Hampton Institute, whence so many of its teachers came, nor the debt of gratitude it owes to its friends among the members of the white race in the North and in the South who have furnished moral and material support. But it should not be forgotten that the success of this school, like that of any other, depends, in the last analysis, less upon the effort of any one individual or group of individuals than upon the native qualities of its pupils and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people from whom they sprang. While the school at Tuskegee owes much to others, I believe it is but fair to say that it owes most to the patience and persistence of the students, and to the simple piety, earnestness and self-sacrifice of their fathers and mothers at home on the farm and plantation.

A careful investigation of the records last spring revealed the fact that, in addition to its 888 graduates, something like 6,000 students, who were not able to remain to complete the full course of study, have been helped to such an extent that they are doing reasonably efficient work. Of the graduates of the school, less than ten per cent., so far as we can ascertain, have been unsuccessful in their trades; and special investigations that we have made indicate that all have increased their economic efficiency, on an average of about three hundred per cent., some more and some less. This shows the increased value that the average Southern white man places on the services of a Negro educated in the trades. It indicates what, under reasonably favorable circumstances, Negroes can do and what they are doing. It ought also to be added, in reply to those who assert that education has not improved the Negro, but rather injured him in respect to his moral life, that so far as we can learn no graduate of Tuskegee has ever been convicted of crime.

The idea uppermost in my mind, when I began the work of establishing the school at Tuskegee, was to do something that would reach and improve the condition of the masses of the Negro people in the South. Up to that time—and even to-day to a large extent—education had not touched, in any real and tangible way, the great majority of the people in what is known as "The Black Belt." I had not been many days in Alabama before I realized this fact. As my knowledge of conditions grew, I became increasingly convinced that any institution which was to be of real service to the millions of the lower South must not confine itself to methods that were suited to some distant community where conditions of life were vastly different. I made up my mind from the first that a school which should perform for the masses the service I had in mind would have to teach its students many things that students in the North and West were taught in their homes. I found that the teaching of books alone was not sufficient for the students who came to Tuskegee to be trained as teachers and leaders. Our students needed to be taught how to sit at table

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and eat properly, the uses of a napkin, table-cloth, knife and fork, and tooth-brush. Large numbers of them were wholly ignorant of the very elements of right living. In addition to this, they had to be taught how to care for tools and animals and how to systematize their labor. The girls had to be trained to an intelligent appreciation of the value of housekeeping, cooking, sewing, laundering.

From the very outset of my work, it has been my steadfast purpose to establish an institution that would provide instruction, not for the select few, but for the masses, giving them standards and ideals, and inspiring in them hope and courage to go patiently forward. I wanted to give Negro young men and women an education that would fit them to take up and carry to greater perfection the work that their fathers and mothers had been doing. I saw clearly that an education that filled them with a "divine discontent," without ability to change conditions, would leave the students, and the masses they were to guide, worse off than they were in their unawakened state. It was my aim to teach the students who came to Tuskegee to live a life and to make a living, to the end that they might return to their homes after graduation, and find profit and satisfaction in building up the communities from which they had come, and in developing the latent possibilities of the soil and the people. To establish this idea, the Tuskegee Institute, with its 1,500 students, its 156 officers, teachers and employees, its 86 buildings, and its varied ramifications for extension work, has come into existence.

Starting in a shanty and a hen-house, with almost no property beyond a hoe and a blind mule, the school has grown up gradually, much as a town grows. We needed food for our tables; farming, therefore, was our first industry, started to meet this need. With the need for shelter for our students, courses in house-building and carpentry were added. Out of these, brick-making and brick-masonry naturally grew. The increasing demand for buildings made further specialization in the industries necessary. Soon we found ourselves teaching tinsmithing, plastering and painting. Classes in cooking were added, because we needed competent persons to prepare the food. Courses in laundering, sewing, dining-room work and nurse-training have been added to meet the actual needs of the school community. This process of specialization has continued as the school increased in numbers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and as the more varied wants of a larger community created a demand, and instruction is now given in thirty-seven industries.

Although we have constantly emphasized at Tuskegee the dignity and the nobility of labor, it has never been my idea that the training of the Negro should be limited to trade or industrial work. I have always felt that our students, in connection with their technical training, should have their minds thoroughly awakened and developed by a severe and systematic training in the academic branches.

Here I might add that Tuskegee's emphasis on industrial education implies by no means a lack of appreciation of the colleges and professional schools. The race needs both kinds of education, and each type of institution complements the work of the other.

But it was recognized that something more than industrial or academic training was necessary if our students were, in any large degree, to make themselves useful in changing the conditions of the masses of their people. They needed an education which not only did not educate them out of sympathy with the masses of their people, but made them actively and practically interested in constructive methods and work among their people. The better to accomplish this end we taught our girls, not only to work at their trades in the schoolroom, but to meet the people in their churches and other gathering-places on Sunday. In addition to the ordinary duties of the schoolroom, teachers who go out from Tuskegee are taught how to conduct monthly farmers' institutes or local farmers' conferences. They are expected to be able to show the farmers how to buy land, to assist them by advice in getting out of debt, and to encourage them to cease mortgaging their crops, and to take active interest in the economic development of their community.

Some months ago, I was rather severely criticised by an educated colored man in Washington because I had spoken rather frankly to the colored people in this section of the country about the habit of buying pianos and organs to put in their rented log-cabins. This man thought the colored people ought to be free to buy pianos and organs just the same as the people of any other race. As far as the right of colored people to buy pianos and organs is concerned, I think the Negroes should feel that they have the same right that any other people have. I do think, however,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that one is doing them service in telling them frankly that, while they have this right, it is hardly the part of wisdom for them to waste money in buying musical instruments before they get a home in which to put them, and before their children have had enough education to use them properly.

During the early days of my work at Tuskegee, I found that the Negro people in this section of the country earned a great deal of money, and were willing to work, and did, for the most part, work hard. What they needed was stimulation and guidance. In order to reach the masses with the knowledge that they most needed, we have worked out several methods of popular education which seem to be peculiarly adapted to the needs of the Negro farming communities. Among them we have (1) mothers' meetings, conducted by Mrs. Washington; (2) visits of teachers and students to communities distant from the school; (3) local Negro conferences, which meet once a month in various sections of the South; (4) the annual Negro Conference, which brings together at Tuskegee Institute every year from 1,200 to 1,400 representatives from various sections of the South, to spend a day in discussing the conditions and needs of the race; (5) the Worker's Conference, composed of officers and teachers of the leading schools for Negroes, which meets at Tuskegee the day after the annual Negro Conference; (6) the County Farmers' Institute, together with the Farmers' Winter Short Course in Agriculture, and the County Fair held in the fall; (7) the National Negro Business League, which seeks to do for the race as a whole what the local business leagues are doing for the communities in which they exist.

In addition to the work performed through these organizations, we give our cooperation, not only to the graduates who are teaching in small country schools, but to a number of large institutions like the Institute at Snow Hill, Alabama, and the Voorhees Industrial School, at Denmark, South Carolina, that are doing in a modified way the kind of work that we are seeking to do at Tuskegee. Sixteen institutions, offshoots of Tuskegee, have grown to a size where they have been incorporated by the State authorities. One of our Trustees, the Rev. R. C. Bedford, gives a large part of his time to keeping in touch, through correspondence and personal visits, with our graduates who are working in these schools and elsewhere throughout the South.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I have been asked in what way my views of Negro education have changed during the twenty-five years and more that I have been engaged in this work. As I look back over the past, I cannot now see that my notions have been modified in any material way during that time. I have sought at all times to put into effect at Tuskegee the ideas I had imbibed under General Armstrong's instruction at Hampton. Whatever difference there is between the work of the Tuskegee and Hampton Institutes grows out of the difference in the conditions of life in the territory surrounding the two schools. We, for example, are in a cotton-raising district. Agriculture plays a larger rôle in Alabama, perhaps, than it does in Virginia. Furthermore, civilizing influences have been at work for a shorter time here than at Hampton. While the Tuskegee students have, perhaps, gone further in the direction of putting up their own buildings than have the students at Hampton, yet the work of the two schools is in all essentials the same. Hampton, being older, is more perfect and complete; Tuskegee, still in the making, is necessarily imperfect, incomplete.

Although I have not in any appreciable way modified my views concerning Negro education within the last twenty-five years, I have found it necessary from time to time to correct impressions that have somehow got abroad. I do not, for example, advocate any kind of industrial or technical training for the Negro that I would not advocate for any other race in the same relative stage of civilization. From time to time, I have thought it necessary to say something that would prevent the impression spreading abroad that industrial education is class education. Nothing could be more harmful to the cause of industrial or technical education than to permit the idea to become current that industrial education was created especially for the benefit of the black race.

But, if I have in no important respect changed my views in regard to industrial education during the twenty-five years that I have been working at Tuskegee, I have become more and more convinced, as I have gained a more extended experience, of the value of the education that is imparted through systematic training of the hand. Of this I have had constant evidence in my acquaintance with a number of students who have appeared dull in their books, and yet have shown themselves extremely methodical and systematic in their work after they have left us and gone

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out into the world to work for themselves. This ability to meet conditions may be largely accounted for by the fact that our students have studied not merely books, but things.

I do not care to venture here an opinion about the nature of knowledge in general; but it will be pretty clear to any one who reflects upon the matter that the only kind of knowledge that has any sort of value for a race that is trying to get on its feet is knowledge that has some definite relation to the daily lives of the men and women who are seeking it.

There is constant danger that boys and girls who have grown up on the farms, with very little familiarity with books and the ideas that one meets in books, will learn to repeat what they hear in the class-room or read in books without being able to interpret what they read. One of the best ways of testing the pupil's knowledge, in such cases, is to compel him in some way to act. In this way, it is possible to use the training of the hand to give definiteness and precision to the ideas acquired in the class-room. The pupil can be led to see the necessity of constantly applying the ideas he has gathered from books to an actual situation, in order to test his knowledge and find out the real significance of what he has learned in the class-room. We have sought to carry out this principle of putting everything learned in the class-room to the test of action in all departments of the school: to supplement and enlarge the knowledge obtained in the industries by studies in the class-room, and to give precision and definiteness to the things learned in the class-room by the practical application of them in the industrial departments.

Even in our Phelps Hall Bible Training School, which, to the ordinary student, seems farthest removed from the practical affairs of life, we have demanded of students, as a test of the value of what they have learned, that they take an active part in one or more of the various lines of extension work in which the school is engaged. While we constantly seek to interest all classes of students in the work of extending the influence of the school to the masses of the people, we have insisted that it was, in a very special sense, the duty of the students in the Bible Training School, most of whom are preparing themselves to go out into the country districts to become leaders of the people, to prove by some form of practical work among the people their capacity for their professions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If I were asked what I consider the most important thing that Tuskegee has accomplished, I should say it is the work it has done with a view to setting the faces of the masses of our people away from the sunset toward the sunrise. A brief explanation will make my meaning clear. I began my work at Tuskegee at the time when the Negro had just been deprived, in a way that is now familiar, of many of his political rights. There was some voting, but few Negroes held office when I first came to Alabama. The Negro people for the most part set great store by the political privileges that had been granted them during the Reconstruction period, and they thought that when they lost these they had lost all. I remember well the sullen sense of despair which seemed to have taken possession of the people at this time. They preserved outwardly the same good nature and cheerfulness which had always characterized them, but deep down in their hearts they had begun to feel that there was no hope for them, and that there was no use for them to try.

The most important work that Tuskegee has done has been to show the masses of our people that, in agriculture, in the industries, in commerce, and in the struggle toward economic development, there are opportunities and a great future for them. In doing this, we have not sought to give the idea that political rights are not valuable or necessary, but rather to impress our people with the truth that economic efficiency was the foundation for political rights, and that in proportion as they made themselves factors in the economic development of the country political rights would naturally and necessarily come to them.

The next important work of our school has been to change the ideas of the masses of the people concerning labor with the hand. When Tuskegee Institute was first opened, practically all the colored people in this part of the South were opposed to industrial education. For many months, the hardest task the school had to face was to overcome the opposition of the people to the notion of a "working-school." At the present time, that battle has been won. So successful have Hampton and Tuskegee been in changing the views of the people on this question that a man, in any part of the country, who now opposes industrial education for the Negro is so exceptional that he is likely to be regarded as eccentric. The students at Tuskegee now count it just as much a part of their education to spend a day on the farm or in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kitchen, in the machine-shop, or in the laundry, as they do to spend a day in studying algebra, chemistry or literature.

Something has been accomplished, also, during the past twenty-five years in interesting the Southern white men and women in a way to let them see and feel the value of educating the black man. For the future of both races, it is just as important to bring about a satisfactory understanding in regard to their mutual relations as it is to do away with the ignorant, hopeless black proletariat which came into existence in the South as one of the results of the Civil War. To me, one of the saddest incidents of our present educational effort in the South is the fact that many of the Southern white people know less about what is really being done for the Negro than do many Northern people living thousands of miles away. In some rational manner, an effort should be made—and we expect to do our part in this direction—to get hold of the thinking and more substantial class of Southern white people, in a manner that will let us have the benefit of their sympathy and cooperation in a larger degree than we have had in the past.

During the succeeding twenty-five years, it is my earnest wish that the whole work at Tuskegee may be more fully perfected and rounded out. I do not mean that we should increase our numbers to any great extent, but that we should make the training more efficient, and that the whole institution and grounds, buildings, apparatus, and teaching-force should be brought to a higher stage of perfection. It is my hope that, sometime during the next twenty-five years, we shall secure an endowment of at least five million dollars, in order that the head of the institution may give a larger part of his time and strength in working immediately for the whole people, to the end that the work of bringing the teaching of our school home to the masses may be given the widest extension possible. My experience has taught me that wherever I go to speak, I not only meet a large number of colored people, but, usually, I am able also to speak to the best white people in the community, and I find that these meetings go a long way toward bringing about better relations between the races and to promote the highest and best interests of both.

It is, perhaps, fruitless to attempt, at the present stage of progress of the Negro race, to predict or even to suggest what can be accomplished during the next twenty-five years for Negro

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upbuilding and moral and material regeneration. I do not believe, however, that we are justified in taking a hopeless or discouraging view of the situation. It should be borne in mind that there are at the present time nearly 10,000,000 persons of Negro ancestry in the United States. In twenty-five years more, judging by the present rate of increase, the number will reach something like 15,000,000 or 16,000,000. This is considerably more than the total population of Belgium and Holland combined.

The position of the Negro in the United States is, in some respects, like that of the Jewish people in the different countries in which they live. They constitute, in a certain sense, a nation within a nation. But there is this difference—that there are little more than one million Jews in the United States. I believe that, if the work which schools like Hampton, Fisk and Tuskegee are doing can be continued and extended, so that the whole Negro population may ultimately have the benefit of the training they give, we may look forward with some confidence to seeing the masses of the Negro population visibly approach, not to the position of that marvellously gifted Hebrew race, but to something like the thrift, the industry, and the sturdy, thorough-going, self-respecting independence of the Hollanders and the Belgians. What that would mean to the Negro race, to the South, and to the world, is something I hardly dare contemplate. But that is, I believe, the thing that we should strive for in the next twenty-five years.

In recent years, this question has been repeatedly and insistently asked: "Suppose the Negro succeeds in making himself master here in America of the white man's civilization, what will be the effect upon the relations of the races?"

Often those who have pressed this question have answered it for themselves in the following manner. They have said: "If the Negro is allowed to remain in this country until he is able to compete with the members of the white race, in the various forms of intellectual and physical labor, one of two consequences will follow; either the weaker race will be exterminated by the stronger, or the two races will amalgamate."

I do not believe that we have reason to fear either one or the other of these consequences. It should always be borne in mind that it takes two races to amalgamate, and the absorption of one by the other cannot be accomplished without the consent of both. I do not believe that the Negro is yet willing to disappear; I be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lieve, rather, that his unwillingness increases in proportion to his intellectual and moral advance. I think it will be found to be a fact that the process of amalgamation has been going on with much less rapidity under freedom than it did under slavery. So long as the Negro was taught that everything that was good was white and everything that was bad was black, so long as he remained a mere chattel, it was natural and inevitable that he should desire to become in everything—in style, manners, thought, and in the color of his skin—white. But now that the Negro is beginning to understand his own possibilities, to believe that he has an independent mission in the world, and to gain that sort of self-respect that comes with the consciousness of that mission, the disposition and the willingness to surrender his racial identity and to detach himself from the life and the destiny of his own people are, I am convinced, steadily decreasing.

The other question, the question of his elimination by force, is one that the Negro will have to face, just as other races have faced it. His position in that regard is not so different from that of the Jews. At any rate, it is a question he cannot escape by going to any other country. As a matter of fact, those who have studied the situation know that the Negro has less protection against the encroachments and the competition of the white race in Africa than he has here in America. The fact that he is in the majority does not help him in Africa any more than it has helped him elsewhere.

I am convinced that any one who will consider the question with patience will come to the conclusion that the only salvation for the Negro people, or for any race, is to make themselves so useful to the rest of the world, so indispensable to their neighbors, that the world will not only tolerate, but desire, their presence. To a large extent, this is already true in the South—more true, I am convinced, than it is in the North, where the Negro has much less opportunity to work than he has in the South. In short, there is nothing for the Negro to do but remain where he is and struggle on and up. The whole philosophy of the Negro question can be written in three words: patience, persistence, fortitude. The really hopeful thing about the situation is that, on the whole, the Negro has done, under the circumstances, the best he could.

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TOLSTOY AS PROPHET.

Notes on the Psychology of Asceticism.

BY VERNON LEE.

In his religious and philosophical writings, Count Tolstoy would seem to represent the prophetic temperament in such incarnation as is likely to become the commonest, indeed perhaps the only possible, one in the near future. For, in the gradual disruption of dogmatic creeds, the man born to the prophetic quality and function tends more and more to be a heretic and an anarchist; to practise an exegesis backed by no authority; and to benefit or harass mankind, to exhibit to mankind the spectacle of prophecy, more and more obviously without any inspiration save the unquestioned one of his own individual constitution. The Prophet, being a type of humanity, represents certain impulses for good and evil existing in numbers of his fellow creatures, is in fact a specimen of a human force of the universe; and he not only displays in crudest isolation special tendencies making for life's greater fruitfulness or sterility, but also directs the scathing light of almost monomaniacal perception on matters which the average routine of existence neglects to our disadvantage. The Prophet is useful as a teacher; but still more useful as a lesson. It is in this double capacity that the following marginal notes may help to put to use the prophet, not the artist, Tolstoy.

I.

"To the man perverted by the false doctrines of the century, it seems," etc., etc.

This form of words, perpetually recurring throughout Tolstoy's didactic writings, acquaints us with one of the chief draw-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

backs of the prophetic mind: an incapacity so utter of conceiving any views different from his own, that they appear monstrous not merely in their results but also in their origin. "Perverse"—"False"—a kind of devil's spawn *in vacuo*. Now, the wonderful tenacity of *false* doctrines and *perverse* attitudes would suggest, to such as are not prophets, that there may be something to be said in their favor; that such *falseness* and *perverseness* may be an inevitable—nay, a necessary—stage of something else; that it is, in some fashion, in league with the ways of things. The theologians of the past could postulate Original Sin or the fundamental Abominableness of Matter; whereas one might expect that the prophets of our own day, Stirner and Nietzsche, quite as much as Tolstoy, would have forfeited this logical advantage and desisted from judging all things as if they had been intended to please just them. Not a bit: the prophetic temperament has remained unchanged; and all prophets—prophets of cynicism, quite as much as prophets of asceticism—display the same alacrity in seating themselves down *ad dexteram Domini*—or, indeed, on the throne off which the Lord has been hustled as some sort of idol. What unhesitating rapidity they display, those great nostrum-mongers, not merely in defining the world's contents and making plans for its complete overhauling, but in packing off everything which does not suit them to the bottomless pit! Mankind, in the mean while, like some half-hearted follower of Savonarola, shoves the *false* and *perverse* doctrines not into the destroying flames, but merely into the dust-heap, whence they are incontinently extracted, for exclusive use, by another prophet or another School of Prophecy. Let no one take these remarks for the raillery of scepticism: the thorough-paced sceptic of modern days (my ingenious friend H. B. Brewster, for instance) is just as much carried away by the spirit of prophecy as the dogmatists whom he scoffs at. I am speaking as a mere looker-on, vaguely conscious that, since they all exist, these various excessive views must each answer to some aspect of reality; vaguely regretting, also, that we, less specially gifted creatures, should waste so much of the little time given us for the application of truth in sorting the litter of exaggerations and the rubbish of anathema with which the great One-sided Ones have encumbered the earth.

The heap of valuable and worthless things constituted by Tolstoy's philosophical and moral writings is the better worth our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sorting that, in trying to understand this latest addition to the literature of prophetic asceticism, we shall be learning to understand, perhaps to select and profit by, some other ascetic doctrines, of so ancient an origin and such habitual repetition that we have almost ceased to look either for their psychological reason or for their practical application.

II.

"Like the penitent thief, I knew that I was unhappy, that I suffered, and that *all the human beings around me were suffering and feeling themselves unhappy* . . . and, even as the penitent thief (nailed to his cross) saw advancing the horrid darkness of death . . . so I saw the same prospect open before me."

The words I have italicized contain the main postulate of all pessimism, and of nearly all asceticism, religious as well as philosophical, Buddhist and Stoical, of Schopenhauer as much as of the "Imitation." The pessimist is unhappy: therefore every one else is; he sees no meaning in life save that of his ascetic formula: therefore there is none; he is afraid of death: therefore fear of death is in every breast. And this gratuitous classification of all mankind under one's own headings is justified by the additional generalization, that those who imagine themselves to feel or think differently are perverted by false doctrine or sunk in beastlike indifference.

III.

After this follows logically the second postulate of such as think, or rather of such as are constituted, like Tolstoy:

"Why had I not earlier put in practice this doctrine which gives me happiness? *The answer is very simple: Because I did not know the truth.*"

At first sight, it seems strange that the creator of such marvellously living beings as Natacha, Peter Besukhoff, Princess Mary, Anna Karenine, Oblonsky or Levine should not have been able to think, what he so clearly felt and showed in them, that human beings do not *seek happiness* but obey instincts, and that the greatest mass of probable happiness in front has little attractive power save when it coincides with the *vis a tergo*, the forward push of cravings, tendencies and habits. One might imagine that in Tolstoy the novelist's conception was so concrete and individual, the novelist's genius so automatic and unreasoning, as to reduce

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the powers of analysis and generalization to almost childish insignificance. Be this as it may, this greatest painter of human character, able to copy with faultless precision the soul's actual workings, seems not to know the rudiments of the soul's physiology or mechanics, on which those workings depend. It never seems to enter his head that, if this "knowledge," this paramount doctrine of such direct application and infallible virtue, has remained hidden, obscured, for near nineteen hundred years, there must have been, in mankind, but a very faint need for a remedy so near at hand; nor that this inefficacy in so long a past argues but small immediate result in the present; those selfsame interests which hid or distorted this doctrine of salvation showing, by their tenacity, that it is absurd to expect them to yield and disappear of a sudden and as by miracle. But the fact is that Tolstoy, much as he would disclaim it, not only admits of miracle, but bases all his hope upon it. His own experience is of miraculous nature, simply because, to his own powers of observation, the thing which really happened, the way it happened, is necessarily hidden. Tolstoy's conversion is one of those of which all religious autobiography is full, and of which Professor William James has put together so fine a volume of specimens. At a given moment in a man's life, either after a period of religious stress or with apparent total suddenness, *something takes place in the soul:* the doubts, scruples, fears, despair, have vanished; and in their place is a new set of hopes, a new vital certainty, or (as the doctor in Ibsen's play would call it) a new "Vital Lie." What has actually happened? The souls liable to such complete change and renovation, sudden or gradual, are those least likely to be able to tell us. For the concentration of one kind of feeling, the unfamiliarity of the elements formerly latent and now dominant, the very completeness of former despair and present joy, make him who experiences such a conversion incapable of observing, and perhaps of conceiving, its real nature.

The conversion of Tolstoy is not a sudden one; but it is characterized by the *mono-ideism* of such phenomena; the intensity and exclusiveness of his long and suicidal broodings did not leave in his soul the lucid, disinterested half which can understand and intelligently record: there is but one self at work, one self floundering in nightmare and suddenly lifted to beatific relief. Tolstoy fails to notice what strikes every spectator from the first—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

namely, that in his least regenerate days, his most carnal and perversely thinking days, he dealt preferably with characters unknown to previous novelists, Peter, André, Levine, men haunted already by the very thought which was to overshadow his own mind, the eternal query: "Why live, since one must die?" That such should have been his heroes shows that he knew more of asceticism than other novelists perhaps capable of creating his other characters—say, Wronsky or Nicholas Rostoff. This, evidently, never strikes Tolstoy himself. Still less, of course, does it occur to him that the importance taken in his mind by that recurring "Why?" let alone the fact of its having, in the midst of prosperity, driven him to the verge of suicide, shows that he was constitutionally destined to concentrate on this problem: or, briefly, that the value of his conversion depended on his passionate need of it; the remedy was commensurate with the evil, and both were in himself, inborn.

This Tolstoy could not see. And, failing to guess that his was a very special and rare case, he attributed his own spiritual drama to the rest of mankind. A large number of his neighbors were visibly discontented and unhappy; a larger still he chose to consider as being so: well, then, their discontent and their unhappiness were due to the same causes as his own. They might, indeed, explain it by poverty, illness, cramped activities, thwarted passions, by anything or everything they chose; that, Tolstoy assured them, was but delusion, and the real matter with them was what had been the matter with himself.

There is in all prophetic persons a sadly comic side, reminding one of those valetudinarians who press the pills or waters which have relieved their liver or their spleen on all the people of their neighborhood with damaged heart, brain or marrow—nay, with poor bruised or broken limbs. Moreover, in the spiritual example, the recalcitrance of supposed fellow sufferers, their clinging to their own diagnosis, especially their making light of their own ills, is instantly set down as a sure sign that all sensation and all judgment have been perverted by the very malady they refuse to own up to. But, worst off of any, those who, in the face of the universal, infallible and painless panacea, actually maintain that, for the present at least, they have no ailments of any kind, that they are (shameless or deluded wretches!) sound in mind and limb —as to those, well, all Tolstoy can say is that, just in proportion to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their contentment with life, they are already dead and done for; galvanized corpses, set on end to gibber and to poison others with their putrescence.

IV.

Let us continue our analysis of Tolstoy's postulates; which, at the same time, is an examination of the modes of thought characteristic of the ascetic attitude and the prophetic temperament.

"Every human being lives in the name of some particular principle; and this principle, in whose name he lives in that given fashion, is no other thing than his religion."

The identification holds good only when the principle in question happens to be of the sort we all mean by "religious." If we accepted Tolstoy's statement without this rider, which makes it tautological, we should be obliged, like H. B. Brewster in his "*Ame Païenne,*" to identify a man's religion, his God, with his dominant impulse or combination of impulses; and the most profane and wicked lives might thus be led—as Hoffmann imagines of the operatic Don Juan's—in the name of the *principle* of Leporello's catalogues. The *vital principle* of most men's lives has been given its right name only by Nietzsche; it is "My Inclination." But it is not of such principles as these that Tolstoy is speaking; and any other principle of life, any principle conscious, formulated and dominating all other impulses and habits, any principle which can be called a religion, exists only in a minority of cases, at least in the sense of constant intellectual reference and constant moral incentive.

V.

"Life is an aspiration after happiness; the aspiration after happiness is life."

This is psychologically false. In reality *life is*—that is, exclusively consists of—no more of this, than of any other very frequent item of consciousness; life being, to a large extent, absorption in this or that concern or interest to the positive exclusion of all "aspiration after happiness." Nor is there any reason why such "aspiration after happiness" should be more frequent; for, in the majority of cases, happiness itself is secured, and best secured, without any such conscious straining after it. Happiness

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is secured, and with it life's furtherance for the individual and race, in that manner which Tolstoy, unable to deny its existence, condemns beforehand with the absurd epithet of "animal"; secured by the play of clashing or coordinated impulses, which, so far from being more particularly *animal,* may happen to be impulses of the highest moral or æsthetic or constructive or intellectual sort.

All pessimism, all asceticism, is founded upon the existence of what Tolstoy calls the "illusory thirst for enjoyment." Now, however numerous the cases where enjoyment proves impossible or mischievous, the continued existence of the human race shows that, ninety-nine times out of a hundred, neither the enjoyment nor the thirst for it is illusory, but, on the contrary, a genuine advantage, making subsequent enjoyment not less, but more, possible by perfecting the sensibilities. The healthy activity of the whole individual, with its inevitable hierarchy of impulses, both secures pleasure and forestalls cloying, and, by its inclusion of intellectual and sympathetic interests, its subordination of others to these, it diminishes conflict with others quite as effectually as does Tolstoy's Renunciation. And here let me say that there is surely something mean in this reciprocal renunciation, resulting in the cessation of struggle and disappointment. Such renunciation is often needful in our imperfect individual case: our eye gives us trouble, and we cast it from us. But such rough-and-ready, such wasteful, destructive methods are surely not admissible in a philosophy of life, in a *counsel of perfection!* The universal, as distinguished from the individual, rule for greater happiness is not self-diminution but assimilation, expansion, the non-ego becoming, in imagination and feelings, an integral part of the ego. Asceticism preaches voluntary impoverishment: my neighbors cease to steal because I possess nothing; I cease to covet, because they possess nothing; 'tis Epictetus's safety after the thieves had carried away his brass lamp. But the law of human life is barter: asking freely and giving fully; mutual enriching through each other's superfluity. Asceticism refuses to admit this law; for all asceticism moves in the logical circle of pain as cause and effect.

VI.

"Men, like all other living creatures, are forced by the conditions of life to live forever at one another's expense, devouring one another literally or metaphorically. And man, in so far as gifted with reason, can-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not blink the fact that every material advantage is obtained by one creature only at the expense of some other creature."

A series of quite gratuitious biological and economical assumptions, which are made more intelligible by a statement in another place that "the workman who wears out his body and hastens his death is giving that body as food to others."

Now, in all these premises, Tolstoy omits one half of the fact—namely, that, in the majority of cases, a human being, while *giving himself,* gets, or has got, something from others. *Taking* by no means implies *stealing,* nor is *benefiting by one's fellows* the same thing as preying on them. The workman is not breaking down his health and hastening his death any faster while working for others than while working for himself, except from occasional reasons quite independent of whom the work is to benefit most. He is not breaking down his health or hastening his own death more than if he were committing excesses of other kinds for his own sole satisfaction; and, except through the accidental or incidental misarrangement of the world, he is *not breaking down his health or hastening on death at all,* but rather the reverse. The detriment to the individual is due to excess as regards himself, not in the least to profitableness to others. The increase of the world's material and spiritual wealth depends upon activity; but activity, when not excessive, is an integration, not a disintegration, of individual life. The world is carried on upon the principle of barter and compensation; and, even in such low forms of life as those where animals or savages actually prey upon each other, the one who feeds upon his victim to-day is bound to be fed upon, as an individual or a class, to-morrow: the lion ends off as the sustenance of vultures, jackals and insects. But Tolstoy, for reasons we shall presently grasp and can already guess at, chooses to consider that all profiting by the existence of others represents an unwilling or a voluntary sacrifice. When it is voluntary, he calls it love; and here again comes a gratuitous assumption. Let us look at this question of Love and of Sacrifice, for it is important and one upon which ordinary thought (though luckily not every-day practice!) is in considerable confusion. Alongside of the sentence about the workman destroying himself for the benefit of others, is another example of what Tolstoy chooses to consider as self-sacrifice: the mother

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suckling her baby. He could not have come by a better refutation of his own theory; for it is plain that the mother is giving life to her child, but it is also plain that her bodily health and her happiness gain by this supposed sacrifice, which is, in reality, an organic advantage. From such an example, however, Tolstoy concludes that "love is really worthy of that name only when it is the sacrifice of self." In one sense, this is quite undeniable; but that sense is not Tolstoy's. For *love* is *preference;* and love leads to self-sacrifice, that is to say, to sacrifice of greater or smaller advantages—nay, even of health, power or life—simply because all preference of one particular thing or group of things leads to sacrifice of other things or groups of things, whether that preference be socially beneficial (which we call "unselfish") or socially detrimental (which we call "selfish"); whether it happen to be duty, ambition, hatred, vanity, lust; whether it be the love of Cordelia or the love of Francesca; though, of course, the measure of every preference (since preference implies alternative) is not the measure more especially of love, and still less is it love's chief characteristic. The characteristic, the typical, fact of love must be sought for in that from which the highest love has, by analogy, borrowed its name, and perhaps, very literally, taken its origin: the union of two creatures who gain happiness in producing a third. The analogous process takes place in the spiritual domain: we give our thought, our fancy, our will, in union with the external world or with the will, the thought or fancy of others; and in so doing create new forms, new ideas, new modes of feeling, nay, new selves.

At the bottom of the Tolstoyan conception of love (which is but the usual ascetic one) is the old, savage notion of sacrifice: of a universe so evil that all happiness must be discounted in misery—"I did but taste a little honey with the end of the rod that was in mine hand, and, lo, I must die!" The implacable gods, the atrocious Cosmos, the Ogre Fee-Faw-Fum at the bottom of every Bean Stalk, insist on increasing suffering through every apparent alleviation or apparent enjoyment. It is worth while, especially in the face of a thinker like Tolstoy, to disentangle the notion of *giving* from the notion of *giving up;* to separate the notion of renunciation, as a choice between two positive or negative *desiderata,* from the notion of renunciation, as mere refusal of good and acceptance of evil. The really fruitful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

act of giving oneself, one's strength, attention, thought or feeling, is not a loss, but the fulfilling of an organic need as essential as that of material or spiritual assimilation; it is, in fact, the inevitable sequel of real assimilation. If the sacrifice of something is often implied in this, it is merely the sacrifice by alternative, the preference of one need or desire or pleasure over another. Such preference as this is a principle of order in the moral realm: the fulness of life means, *ipso facto,* the constant checking of the less important by the more important; it means moderation because it means alternative, selection, subordination and hierarchy of the impulses of which life consists. The vanity of the pursuit of pleasure, of which Tolstoy, like every moralist, makes (and rightly, perhaps) so much capital, results from the absence of such a complex hierarchy of impulse: the larger part of the pleasure-seeker is sacrificed to a momentary desire, and that omitted bulk of his nature either upsets the satisfaction aimed at, or leaves the unruly desire to languish in isolation.

But Tolstoy, like all ascetics, seeks his remedy not in moderation, not in the development of other impulses, not in fact in the enriching of the individual life, but in its impoverishment. *Moral Good* is, according to him, that condition where man pursues nothing for its own sake or his own ends, and nothing for the interest and pleasure of the pursuit; but only for the sake of another human being, or of a vague sense of duty personified as God. Tolstoy's ideal of life is, like his notion of love, a notion of diminution, of sacrifice; and it seems likely that, even as in the ritual of primeval man, the ascetic conception of sacrifice as such, of sacrifice as loss, impoverishment, mutilation, is very closely connected with the fear of death; sacrifice being, however inexplicitly, a commutation, a partial, symbolical or vicarious death, instead of a total and actual one.

VII.

In the case of Tolstoy, there is the repeated and unqualified expression of the constant thought, the constant fear, of Death. Already, in his pseudo-autobiography, we find the following funeral oration on the old housekeeper Natalia Savichna:

"She accomplished the best and greatest act of the life of this world: dying without regret and without fear."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now, this fear, whose absence thus seems a rare form of holiness, is, in a sense, a misconception, a misconception revealing the fundamental complexion of all asceticism. Let us examine it. *Life* and *Death* form together one of those false antitheses which have been pointed out by that subtle analyst, Gabriel Tarde. Life and Death are opposed in position; but not, so to speak, in the ground which they cover or the facts they respectively include. Because *what is alive* cannot also *be dead,* and *what is dead* cannot also be *alive,* we have, in our slovenly fashion, grown accustomed to think of the fact of being alive and the fact of being dead as of equal importance, intensity and extension. We overlook the real antithesis, which is between *death* and *birth,* the *two points without magnitude* between which extends life. Moreover, we have confused *death* with the process of dying, often accompanied by illness or preceded by decay, which is a portion, sometimes a considerable portion, of the processes of life. Nor is this all. The immense part played in our life by the death of others gives the notion of dying a frightful duration in our consciousness, and makes us think, by analogy, that our own death also is a wide blot or oil spot in our life. Hence death, which, being the limit of life, exists in reality outside it, becomes, so far as it is thought about and feared, a most important and terrible part of life.

Life is consciousness; and, except in consciousness, death is nothing; it becomes, in consciousness, grief or terror. But grief and terror are realities. Of course; since it is thanks to them that death, or rather the notion of death, has come to poison so much of life. Heaven forbid I should argue that either philosophy or religion can ever abolish grief or fear, abolish the agony of departing, the agony of being left behind. Loss is loss, and parting is parting, a fact, a horror, which nothing can efface. But let us not add to these the dread either of life or of death, deeply, indissolubly entangled as they become. And if philosophy represent any higher truth, and religion any higher utility, let them strive to diminish this hideous tangle, to hold our thoughts and feelings asunder; make us see things as they are, and make them, so far as our attitude toward them goes, a little more what they should be. Life, our own and that of our beloved, is good in proportion as it is safe and complete, as it is untouched by the chance, the fact, but worst of all, the *fear,* of death. And all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

healthy life tends to cast forth from itself the vain and paralyzing thought of its own end.

VIII.

We have seen that the prophetic temper is characterized by a tendency to *mono-ideism*, and that mono-ideism invariably tends to jealousy of all that it excludes. One of Tolstoy's most characteristic pieces of such mono-ideistic jealousy, is his elaborate catalogue of sinful indulgences; of what, especially, he puts under the rubric "intoxication," including therein, as venial or mortal sin, the intoxication not merely by wine, tobacco or fleshly love, but by art, literature, "gestures and sounds," and even bicycling. The exaggeration is so gross that one fails at first to conceive how it could come about in a mind as originally excellent, and a life as many-sided, as Tolstoy's. But the explanation, furnished by comparison with the raptures of earlier mystics, appears to be that the ascetic has his own form of intoxication. Here is Tolstoy's account of his state of beatitude after his conversion has been consummated:

"All that seems evil to me does so merely because I believe in myself and not in God; and as, from this life where *it is so easy to do His will, since His will is mine*, I can fall nowhere except into Him, what I possess is complete joy and good. *And all I could write would fail to express what I feel.*"

Let us consider these seemingly simple statements. It is so easy for Tolstoy to do God's will! God's will is, after all, only Tolstoy's; Tolstoy can fall only into God! Is this presumptuous certainty of righteousness, this identification of the individual impulse and the moral law, this unmixed and ineffable joy, anything save an intoxication of a more insidious, but scarcely less unwholesome, kind? Taking in the full meaning of such words as these, one wonders whether there will ever arise a new habit of spiritual cleanness, of intellectual chastity, making men question and reject emotional self-indulgence like this, which sullies the reason and sterilizes the will. One doubts it. For, from century to century, mankind may be watched yielding, even as to lower kinds of self-indulgence, to the subtle and high-flown temptation of mysticism. This temptation consists in attributing to an emotional state of our own (the state of Nietzche's Zara-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thustra, as much as the state of Kipling's poor old Lama) the name and the importance of a generalized objective fact; nay, of the greatest and most solemn of facts which man has thus generalized: the will of God, the Nature of things.

The very recurrence of such a process of spiritual intoxication implies, it may be said, a recurrent need of it. Yes; but a need which results from other needs being neglected. Between the cravings which produce science, art, laws—nay, food and progeny —and the mystical craving such as this of Tolstoy there is a fundamental difference: they are fruitful, and it is barren.

And this word "barren" suggests another of the drawbacks of asceticism. In its exclusiveness, its mono-ideism, its readiness to condemn all save itself, asceticism tends to waste much of the moral resources (so cruelly needed!) of ordinary mortals, and, on the other hand, to get its moral gifts rejected by those who require them most; its teaching is shelved as dead letter, or, at best, counsel of perfection.

Renounce the world, preaches Tolstoy; despise, cease to relish, such of the world's work, of the body's functions, as cannot be relinquished; let nothing touch you for its own sake or your own; eradicate self from your thoughts and feelings, and replace it by your neighbor, by mankind, by that impersonal personification of ideals which is Tolstoy's notion of God.

"If such be saintliness, chivalrousness, sentiment," answers the rest of mankind silently to itself, "by all means keep it on a shelf out of the way of ordinary life. Truthfulness, justice, chastity, mercy, are clearly quite unsuitable to the increase of wealth and the rearing of families; and is it not the saints and prophets, Tolstoy for instance, who tell us so?"

Now, as a matter of fact, to what save daily life can ideals, sentiment, saintliness, be profitably applied? Truthfulness, honesty, justice, chastity, mercy, are nothing but correctives of this world's ways; and it is only as such correctives that, save for the æsthetic pleasure of a divinity, they can ever be wanted. Unworldliness must be cultivated because our interests are legitimately worldly.

But holiness and heroism, precious because they are useful, have been considered as precious apart from use. Saints and heroes have been cultivated like rare and wonderful flowers, incapable of ever turning into fruit for food and seed. And, as a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

result of such isolation and sterility, mankind has come to be divided—as we see it in Buddhism, in Christian monasticism and less crassly elsewhere—into the church and the world: those who accept life and sin, and those who kill the body, or all the body stands for, in order to perfect the soul. Like every other ascetic, Tolstoy, in preaching his doctrine of renunciation, is unconsciously giving in to the vicious automatism which sunders the natural man from the saint, and which discourages all application of higher feelings to ordinary existence on the score that ordinary existence can never be composed of higher feelings only. And in so far Tolstoy merely increases the modern tendency to question the efficacy of all moral teaching, to doubt the wholesomeness of sentiment and to consider ideals of conduct either as a mere symptom, an *epiphenomenon*, a fly on the axletree of progress, or (and human illogicalness reconciles both indictments) as a mischievous interference with the automatic ways of natural selection. It would, of course, be more philosophical to consider the continued recurrence of such ascetic or idealizing tendencies as a proof of their utility, despite all drawbacks, in helping on the practical existence of mankind. But ascetics have treated their especial soul-medicine or soul-food as the one panacea; and mankind (as prone to exaggeration as the prophets themselves) has developed a tendency to consider the dealers in panaceas as quacks or the victims of quacks.

IX.

The foregoing notes have attempted to set forth some of the chief peculiarities of the ascetic view of life, and of the prophetic temperament, as we may study them united in the person of Tolstoy. We have taken stock of the pessimistic basis of asceticism, its rejection of moderation, equilibrium of function, and such moral improvements as rest upon them, in opposition to wholesale renunciation; its passion for sacrifice and its preoccupation with death; finally, its tendency to a divorce between spirituality and life. In a similar manner, we have had occasion to verify the isolated and one-sided attitude of the born prophet; his attribution of his own moods and needs to the rest of the world, and his jealousy of, nay, hostility towards, every other mode of being; his incapacity for assimilating the ideas of others, for meeting them half-way and, of course, for feeling any correc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion or check to his own notions; briefly, his mono-ideism, and his mixture (odd, but so explicable) of complete self-belief and utter scepticism of received opinion.

And, having set these studies so far before the reader, I can forestall his question, and shall endeavor to answer it; to account for our instinctive sympathy with the seemingly useless teachings of asceticism, as I have had to answer it for myself in the course of my reading of Tolstoy.

This usefulness, these uses, result from the same peculiarities as the faults and the drawbacks. Isolation and mono-ideism give the ascetic and the prophet an extraordinary freedom of view, wherever his own definite attitude and limited idea are not concerned. Unconscious of those sympathizing and imitative impulses which compact other individuals with their fellows; untouched by any of the temptations which make others blink and compromise; inattentive to any other man's views and, therefore, perfectly sceptical towards them; and harassed, moreover, through and through, by organic dissatisfaction and unrest, this thinker, alone with his own thoughts and feelings (his eagle and his serpent, like Nietzsche's Zarathustra) is the most ruthless of critics and destroyers. Every ascetic is, in essence, an anarchist and a nihilist, a "sayer of 'No'" to the accepted life of the world—in the words (more significant than he, perhaps, knew) of James Hinton, a "Law Breaker," since the only law he believes in is the law of his own exceptional and isolated way of being. Hence he sees, as no laughing sceptic ever can, through every exaggeration, every "vital lie" save his own. The dominant and recurrent thought of all ascetics, from Buddhism and Ecclesiastes, through Stoicism and Christian Mysticism to the smallest modern revivalist, is *vanity*—the emptiness, non-existence, of everything save their own narrow wishes, needs and habits. Now, this attitude of mind corresponds to a great deal that really exists: in the happy-go-lucky, lazy, yet hurried, processes of life, there is quite an enormous amount which is dead letter, perfunctory, wasteful and mischievous; results of imperfect evolution, like those useless organs, those imperfect adaptations, which, according to the ingenious paradox of Dr. Metchnikoff, account for all disease, all vice and suffering, but which an instinct of social safety or individual laziness goes on admiring, as the Bridgewater writers admired the "harmonious designs of Nature." On to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all such perfunctory, dead letter, all such lying things, all such imperfect adaptations and mischievous survivals, the ascetic, the prophet, the marvellous anarchist, Tolstoy, directs his ruthless clear-sightedness. We all know his chapters on luxury, on the pseudo-work of the so-called intellectual classes, on the pseudo-morality of official religion, on so many of the idle activities which give us our daily bread or our daily ration of self-satisfaction. His immense and wearisome volume of art remains as a most useful *memento vivere* or *memento mori* to all of us who talk glibly of the holiness of beauty and its social mission. "The Kreutzer Sonata" probably aroused universal hostility less by its morbid and unchaste (monkish!) kind of chastity, than by its terribly true criticism of so much corruption and enervation hidden secure in the sacred mysteries of marriage and family life. And the writings on War are but the more moving and more explicit development of the remark of Tarde's, that, if the Past had not left us engines and institutions for warfare, the reciprocal destruction of national life and wealth would certainly never have originated in times as comparatively rational as ours. These and similar attacks on various forms of our smug moral callousness or vainglorious moral barbarism, are summed up in a thought which recurs throughout Tolstoy's works, beginning with his great novels:

"All this comes about, thanks solely to that social and administrative machinery whose business it is to subdivide the responsibility for evil done, in such fashion that no one should feel to what extent these acts are contrary to his nature. . . . *It is sufficient if a man free himself for an instant from this tangled net, in order to see the things which are contrary to his nature.*"

That is exactly what Tolstoy does for us. His unsociable and sceptical temper, his constitutional fault-finding, allow him to see, and to show us, one of the chief drawbacks (for every moral machinery, every human or cosmic arrangement has its drawback) of that normal automatic living from impulse to impulse, or, if you choose, from hand to mouth, which secures the continuance and improvement of the race, and, on the whole, the tolerable happiness of the individual. The question "Why?" "To what purpose?" which becomes, in the case of some of Tolstoy's heroes and in his own, misery and paralysis when applied to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

totality of existence itself, is salutary when we apply it every now and then to the detail of life. For it is then no longer: "What is the use of my being alive?" but the wholly different query: "Why, being alive, being what I am and wishing in a given way, am I nevertheless acting in this other way, which is inconsistent with my general life, personality and wishes?"

Yes; there is need of such occasional scattering of our best established habits and most necessary shams and shibboleths. Nietzsche is right in asking for a constant "revaluing of all standards of value." Only—what Nietzsche did not guess, and the world does not recognize—such has been the mission not of Epicureans and Cynics (falling in, as they do, with every-day habits), but of the far more ruthless, because more mono-ideistic and more unpractical, destructiveness of the prophets of asceticism.

Moreover, apart from its constant criticism of moral routine and its indefatigable exposure of perfunctoriness and hypocrisy, apart from its negative merit in demolishing so many cherished *vital lies,* and making the individual soul stand without shelter from the lightnings and the whirlwinds of the spiritual heavens; apart from its great functions of destruction (bringing, in Christ's words, "not peace, but a sword"), all progress owes a deep debt to asceticism of every denomination. For asceticism has given success to unworldliness, and made modesty and scrupulousness illustrious. The adoration of the *saint,* the triumphant enshrining of his poor bones, has been a salutary practice; since, even if that saint's virtues were mistaken, it was the desire for virtue, for acceptableness in God's eyes, which made him glorious in the eyes of men. It has been a help to progress that sanctity could compensate for poverty and weakness—nay, that poverty and weakness should have their disgrace removed; and more particularly in times when poverty was as often the result of one's neighbor's unscrupulousness as of one's own lack of initiative; and weakness was better for others than being a ruffian.

The school which has arisen in violent antagonism to ascetic self-denial, that of Nietzsche and the "Will to Power," bred, as it is, in times of comparative liberty and safety for the individual, has overlooked the fact that, in the past, a handful of stupid roughs, or the caprice of a delirious crowned degenerate, could in ten minutes destroy the results of years and years of industry, in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

genuity, self-command, in fact, of every combination of intellectual, moral and physical efficiency. In such a past,—and it is still at our door (I write within a week of the suppression of the St. Petersburg rising)—the saint is the necessary corrective, in mankind's judgment, for the atrocious success of the violent man or the intriguer. And, so long as we continue abetting success which is obtained to the detriment of others, so long shall we require the worship of the saint, as such. Asceticism is the inevitable outcome, because it is the natural corrective, of moral callousness. And, so long as the market and the home are no better than they are, we shall require to retire now and again into a church—built, if not of stone, then of reverent thoughts—in commemoration of some just, and gentle and austere man. Nay, we shall require to feel at times the impulse to self-chastisement, self-abasement and self-mutilation, so long as our daily life remains as thoughtless, mean, grasping and bestial as it often is.

And herein lies the secret of Tolstoy, as of all ascetics and prophets: of his exaggerations, his absurdities, his—let us call them by their rightful name—ravings; and of our listening, and feeling that we are right in listening, to them.

The destructiveness of asceticism is blind and excessive; it behooves our spiritual activity and discipline to make use of this dangerous moral force, as of any of the other forces of nature, bidding it work for our benefit and not to our hurt. But, even while we remain unable to direct it to our purposes, this disruptive energy of asceticism and prophecy is one of the necessary purifiers of our stagnating souls. It is good to be asked, "To what purpose?" by a Tolstoy, although our answer may differ so widely from the one he preaches.

VERNON LEE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PHILADELPHIA.

BY HENRY JAMES.

I.

To be at all critically, or as we have been fond of calling it "analytically," minded—over and beyond an inherent love of the general many-colored picture of things—is to be subject to the superstition that objects and places, coherently grouped, disposed for human use and addressed to it, must have a sense of their own, a mystic meaning proper to themselves, to give out: to give out, that is, to the participant at once so interested and so detached as to be moved to a report of the matter. That perverse person is obliged to take it for a working theory that the essence of almost any settled aspect of anything may be extracted by the chemistry of criticism, and may give us its right name, its formula, for convenient use. From the moment the critic finds himself sighing, to save trouble, in a difficult case, that the cluster of appearances can *have* no sense, from that moment he begins, and quite consciously, to go to pieces: it being the prime business and the high honor of the painter of life always to *make* a sense—and to make it most in proportion as the immediate aspects are loose or confused. The last thing decently permitted him is to recognize incoherence—to recognize it, that is, as baffling; though, of course, he may present and portray it, in all richness, *as* incoherence. That, I think, was what I had been mainly occupied for in New York; and I quitted so qualified a joy, under extreme stress of winter, with a certain confidence that I should not have moved even a little of the way southward without practical relief: relief which came in fact, ever so promptly, at Philadelphia, on my feeling, unmistakably, the change of half the furniture of consciousness. This change put on, immediately, the friendliest, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

handsomest aspect—supplied my intelligence on the spot with the clear, the salient note. I mean by this, not that the happy definition or synthesis instantly came—came with the perception that character and sense were there, only waiting to be disengaged; but that the note, as I say, was already, within an hour, the germ of these things, and that the whole flower, assuredly, wouldn't fail to bloom. I was in fact sniffing up its fragrance after I had looked out for three minutes from one of the windows of a particularly wide-fronted house and seen the large residential Square that lay before me shine in its native light. This light, remarkably tender, I thought, for that of a winter afternoon, matched with none other I had ever seen, and announced straight off fifty new circumstances—an enormous number, in America, for any prospect to promise you in contradistinction from any other. It was not simply that, beyond a doubt, the outlook was more *méridional;* a still deeper impression had begun to work, and, as I felt it more and more glimmer upon me, I caught myself about to jump, with a single leap, to my synthesis. I, of course, stayed myself in the act, for there would be too much, really, yet to come; but the perception left me, I even then felt, in possession of half the ground on which later experience would proceed. It was not too much to say, as I afterwards saw, that I had in those few illumined moments put the gist of the matter into my pocket.

Philadelphia, incontestably then, was the American city, of the large type, that didn't *bristle*—just as I was afterwards to recognize in St. Louis the nearest approach to companionship with it in this respect; and to recognize in Chicago, I may parenthetically add, the most complete divergence. It was not only, moreover, that at the ample, tranquil window there, Philadelphia *didn't* "bristle" (to that first precious freshness of view), but that it essentially couldn't and wouldn't, ever; that no kind of demonstration could be thought of, in fine, as more foreign to its genius. I don't just now go into the question of what the business of bristling, in an American city, may be estimated as consisting of; so infallibly is one aware when the thousand possible quills *are* erect, and when, haply, they are not—such a test does the restored absentee find, at least, in his pricked sensibility. A place may abound in its own sense, as the phrase is, without bristling in the least—it is liable, indeed, to bristle most, I think, when not too

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

securely possessed of any settled sense to abound in. An imperfect grasp of such a luxury is not the weakness of Philadelphia —just as that admirable comprehensive flatness in her which precludes the image of the porcupine figured to me from the first, precisely, as her positive source of strength. The absence of the note of the perpetual perpendicular, the New York, the Chicago note—and I allude here to the material, the constructional, exhibition of it—seemed to symbolize exactly the principle of indefinite level extension, and to offer, refreshingly, a challenge, to horizontal, to lateral, to more or less tangential, to rotary, or better still, to absolute centrifugal motion. If it was to befall me, during my brief but various acquaintance with the place, not to find myself more than two or three times hoisted or lowered by machinery, my prime illumination had been an absolute forecast of that immunity—a virtue of general premonition in it at which I have already glanced. I should in fact, I repeat, most truly, or most artfully, repaint my little picture by mixing my colors with the felt amenity of that small crisis, and by showing how this, that and the other impression to come had had, while it lasted, quite the definite prefigurement that the chapters of a book find in its table of contents. The afternoon blandness, for a fugitive from Madison Avenue in January snow, didn't mean nothing; the little marble steps and lintels and cornices and copings, all the so clear, so placed accents in the good prose text of the mildly purple houses across the Square, which seemed to wear them, as all the others did, up and down the streets, in the manner of nice white stockings, neckties, collars, cuffs, didn't mean nothing; and this was somehow an assurance that joined on to the vibration of the view produced, a few hours before, by so merely convenient a circumstance as my taking my place, at Jersey City, in the Pennsylvania train.

I had occasion, repeatedly, to find the Pennsylvania Railroad a beguiling and predisposing influence—in relation to various objectives; and indeed I quite lost myself in the singularity of this effect, which existed for me, certainly, only in that connection, touching me with a strange and most agreeable sense that the great line in question, an institution with a style and *allure* of its own, is not, even the world over, as other railroads are. It absolutely, with a little frequentation, affected me as better and higher than its office or function, and almost as supplying one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with a mode of life intrinsically superior: as if it ought really to be on its way to much grander and more charming places than any that happen to mark its course—as if, indeed, should one persistently keep one's seat, not getting out anywhere, it would in the end carry one to some such ideal city. One might, under this extravagant spell, which always began to work for me at Twenty-third Street and on the constantly adorable Ferry, have fancied the train, disvulgarized of passengers, steaming away, in disinterested empty form, to some terminus too noble to be marked in *our* poor schedules. The consciousness of this devotion would have been thus like that of living, all sublimely, up in a balloon. It was not, however—I recover myself—that if I had been put off at Philadelphia I was not, for the hour, contented; finding so immediately, as I have noted, more interest to my hand than I knew at first what to do with. There was the quick light of explanation, following on everything else I have mentioned—the light in which I had only to turn round again and see where I was, and how it was, in order to feel everything "come out" under the large friendliness, the ordered charm and perfect peace of the Club, housing me with that *whole* protection the bestowal of which on occasion is the finest grace of the hospitality of American clubs. Philadelphia, manifestly, was beyond any other American city, a *society*, and was going to show as such, as a thoroughly confirmed and settled one—which fact became the key, precisely, to its extension on one plane, and to its having no pretext for bristling. Human groups that discriminate in their own favor do, one remembers, in general, bristle; but that is only when they have not been really successful, when they have not been able to discriminate enough, when they are not, like Philadelphia, settled and confirmed and content. It would clearly be impossible not to regard the place before me as possessed of this secret of serenity to a degree elsewhere—at least among ourselves—unrivalled. The basis of the advantage, the terms of the secret, would be still to make out—which was precisely the high interest; and I was afterwards to be justified of my conviction by the multiplication of my lights.

New York, in that sense, had appeared to me, then, not a society at all, and it was rudimentary that Chicago would be one still less; neither of them, as a human group, having been able to discriminate in its own favor with anything like such success,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The proof of that would be, obviously, in one's so easily imputing to them alteration, extension, development; a change somehow unimaginable in the case of Philadelphia, which was a fixed quantity and had filled to the brim, one felt—and wasn't that really to be part of the charm ?—the measure of her possibility. Boston even was thinkable as subject to mutation; had I not in fact just seemed to myself to catch her in the almost uncanny inconsequence of change ? There had been for Boston the old epigram that she wasn't a place, but a state of mind; and that might remain, since we know how frequently states of mind alter. Philadelphia, then, wasn't a place, but a state of consanguinity, which is an absolute, final condition. She had arrived at it, with nothing in the world left to bristle for, or against; whereas New York, and above all Chicago, were only, and most precariously, on the way to it, and, indeed, having started too late, would probably never arrive. There were, for them, interferences and complications; they knew, and would yet know, other conditions, perhaps other beatitudes; only the beatitude I speak of—that of being, in the composed sense, a society—was lost to them forever. Philadelphia, without complications or interferences, enjoyed it in particular through having begun to invoke it in time. And now she had nothing more to invoke; she had everything; her *cadres* were all full; her imagination was at peace. This, exactly again, would be the reason of the bristling of the other places: the *cadres* of New York, Chicago, Boston, being as to a third of them empty, and as to another third objectionably filled—with much consequent straining, reaching, heaving, both to attain and to eject. What makes a society was thus, more than anything else, the number of organic social relations it represents; by which logic Philadelphia would represent nothing *but* organic social relations. The degrees of consanguinity were the *cadres;* every one of them was full; it was a society in which every individual was as many times over cousin, uncle, aunt, niece, and so on through the list, as poor human nature is susceptible of being. These degrees are, when one reflects, the only really organic social relations; and, when they are all there for every one, the scheme of security, in a community, has been worked out. Philadelphia, in other words, would not only be a family, she would be a "happy" one, and a probable proof that the happiness comes as a matter of course if the family but be large enough. Consan-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guinity provides the marks and features, the type and tone and ease, the common knowledge and the common consciousness, but number would be required to make these things social. Number, accordingly, for her perfection, was what Philadelphia would have—it having been clear to me still, in my charming Club and at my illuminating window, that she couldn't *not* be perfect. She would be, of all goodly villages, the very goodliest, probably, in the world; the very largest and flattest and smoothest, the most rounded and complete.

II.

The simplest account of such success as I was to have in putting my vision to the test will be, I think, to say that the place never for a moment belied to me that forecast of its animated intimacy. Yet it might be just here that a report of my experience would find itself hampered—this learning the lesson, from one vivid page of the picture-book to another, of how perfectly "intimate" Philadelphia is. Such an exhibition would be, prohibitively, the exhibition of private things, of private things only, and of a charmed contact with them, were it not for the great circumstance which, when what I have said has been fully said, remains to be taken into account. The state of infinite cousinship colors the scene, makes the predominant tone; but you get a light upon it that is worth all others from the moment you see it as, ever so savingly, historic. This perception, moreover, promptly operates; I found it stirred, as soon as I went out or began to circulate, by all immediate aspects and signs. The place "went back," or, in other words, the social equilibrium, forestalling so that of the other cities, had begun early, had had plenty of time on its side, and thus had its history behind it,—the past that looms through it, not at all luridly, but so squarely and substantially, to-day, and gives it, by a mercy, an extension other than the lateral. This, frankly, was required, it struck me, for the full comfort of one's impression—for a certain desirable and imputable richness. The backward extension, in short, is the very making of Philadelphia; one is so uncertain of the value one would attach to her being as she is if she hadn't been so by prescription and for a couple of centuries. This has established her right and her competence; the fact is the parent, so to speak, of her consistency and serenity; it has made the very law under which her parts and pieces have held so closely together. To walk her streets is to note with all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

promptness that William Penn *must* have laid them out—no one else could possibly have done it so ill. It was his best—though, with our larger sense for a street, it is far from ours; we at any rate no more complain of them, nor suggest that they might have been more liberally conceived, than we so express ourselves about the form of the chairs in sitting through a morning call.

I found myself liking them, then, as I moved among them, just in proportion as they conformed, in detail, to the early pattern—the figure, for each house, of the red-faced old gentleman whose thick eyebrows and mustache have turned to white; and I found myself detesting them in any instance of a new front or a new fashion. They were narrow, with this aspect as of a double file of grizzled veterans, or they were nothing; the narrowness had been, positively, the channel or conduit of continuity, of character; it made the long pipe on which the tune of the place was played. From the moment it was in any way corrected, the special charm broke—the charm, a rare civic possession, as of some immense old ruled and neatly inked chart, not less carefully than benightedly flattened out, stretching its tough parchment under the very feet of all comings and goings. This was an image with which, as it furthermore seemed to me, everything else consorted—above all, the soothing truth that Philadelphia was, yes, beyond cavil, solely and singly Philadelphian. There was an interference absent, or one that I at least never met: that sharp note of the outlandish, in the strict sense of the word, which I had already found almost everywhere so disconcerting. I pretend here, of course, neither to estimate the numbers in which the grosser aliens may actually have settled on these bland banks of the Delaware, nor to put my finger on the principle of the shock I had felt it, and was still to feel it, in their general power to administer; for I am not now concerned so much with the impression made by one's almost everywhere meeting them as with the impression made by one's here and there failing of it. They may have been gathered, in their hordes, in some vast quarter unknown to me and of which I was to have no glimpse; but what would this have denoted, exactly, but some virtue in the air for reducing their presence, or their effect, to naught? There precisely was the difference from New York—that they themselves had been in that place half the virtue, or the vice, in the air, and that there were few of its agitations to which they had not something to say.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The logic of the case had been visible to me, for that matter, on my very first drive from the train—from that precious "Pennsylvania" station of Philadelphia which was to strike me as making a nearer approach than elsewhere to the arts of ingratiation. There was an object or two, windowed and chimneyed, in the central sky—but nothing to speak of: I then and there, in a word, took in the admirable flatness. And if it seemed so spacious, by the same token, this was because it was neither eager, nor grasping, nor pushing. It drew its breath at its ease, clearly—never sounding the charge, the awful "Step lively!" of New York. The fury of the pavement had dropped, in fine, as I was to see it drop, later on, between Chicago and St. Louis. This affected me on the spot as symbolic, and I was to have no glimpse of anything that gainsaid the symbol. It was somehow, too, the very note of the homogeneous; though this, indeed, is not, oddly enough, the head under which at St. Louis my impression was to range itself. I at all events here gave myself up to the vision—that of the vast, firm chess-board, the immeasurable spread of little squares, covered *all* over by perfect Philadelphians. It was an image, in face of some of the other features of the view, dissimilar to any by which one had ever in one's life been assaulted; and this elimination of the foreign element was what had been required to make it consummate. Nothing is more notable, through the States at large, than that hazard of what one may happen, or may not happen, to see; but the only use to be made of either accident is, clearly, to let it stand and to let it serve. This intensity and ubiquity of the local tone, that of the illimitable *town*, serves so successfully for my sense of Philadelphia that I should feel as if a little masterpiece of the creative imagination had been destroyed by the least correction. And there is, further, the point to make that if I knew, all the while, that there was something more, and different, and less beatific, under and behind the happy appearance I grasped, I knew it by no glimmer of direct perception, and should never in the world have guessed it if some sound of it had not, by a discordant voice, been, all superfluously, rather tactlessly, dropped into my ear.

It was not, however, disconcerting at the time, this presentation, as in a flash, of the other side of the medal—the other side being, in a word, as was mentioned to me, one of the most lurid pages in the annals of political corruption. The place, by this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revelation, was two distinct things—a Society, from far back, the society I had divined, the most genial and delightful one could think of, and then, parallel to this, and not within it, nor quite altogether above it, but beside it and beneath it, behind it and before it, enclosing it as in a frame of fire in which it still had the secret of keeping cool, a proportionate City, the most incredible that ever was, organized all for plunder and rapine, the gross satisfaction of official appetite—organized, in fine, for eternal iniquity and impunity. Such were the conditions, it had been hinted to me—from the moment the medal spun round; but I even understate, I think, in speaking of the knowledge as only not disconcerting. It was better than that, for it positively added the last touch of color to my framed and suspended picture. Here, strikingly, then, was an American *case*, and presumably one of the best; one of the best, that is, for some study of the wondrous problem, admiration and amazement of the nations, who yearn over it from far off: the way in which sane Society and pestilent City, in the United States, successfuly cohabit, each keeping it up with so little of fear or flutter from the other. The thing presents itself, in its prime unlikelihood, as a thorough good neighboring of the Happy Family and the Infernal Machine —the machine so rooted as to continue to defy removal, and the family still so indifferent, while it carries on the family business of buying and selling, of chattering and dancing, to the danger of being blown up. It is all puzzled out, from afar, as a matter of the exchange, and in a large degree of the observance, from side to side, of guarantees, and the interesting thing to get at, for the student of manners, will ever be just this mystery of the terms of the bargain. I must add, none the less, that, though one was, one's self, inevitably, and always and everywhere, that student, my attention happened to be, or rather was obliged to be, confined to one view of the agreement. The arrangement is obviously, between the great municipalities and the great populations, on the grand scale, and I lacked opportunity to look at it all round. I had but my glimpse of the apparently wide social acceptance of it—that is, I saw but the face of the medal that is most turned to the light of day, and could note that nowhere so much as in Philadelphia was any carking care, in the social mind, any uncomfortable consciousness, as of a skeleton at the banquet of life, so gracefully veiled.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This struck me (on my looking back, afterwards, with more knowledge,) as admirable, as heroic, in its way, and as falling in altogether with inherent habits of sociability, gayety, gallantry, with that felt presence of a "temperament" with which the original Quaker drab seems to flush—giving it, as one might say for the sake of the figure, something of the iridescence of the breast of a well-fed dove. The original Quaker drab is still there, and, ideally, for the picture, up and down the uniform streets, one should see a bland, broad-brimmed, square-toed gentleman, or a bonneted, kerchiefed, mittened lady, on every little flight of white steps; but the very note of the place has been the "worldly" overscoring, for most of the senses, of the primitive monotone, the bestitching of the drab with pink and green and silver. The mixture has been, for a social effect, admirably successful, thanks, one seems to see, to the subtle, the charming absence of pedantry in the Quaker purity. It flushes gracefully, that temperate prejudice (with its predisposition to the universal *tutoiement)* turning first but to the prettiest pink; so that we never quite know where the drab has ended and the color of the world has begun. The "disfrocked" Catholic is too strange, the paganized Puritan too angular; it is the accommodating Friend who has most the secret of a *modus vivendi.* And if it be asked, I may add, whether, in this case of social Philadelphia, the genius for life, and what I have called the "gallantry" of it above all, wouldn't have been better shown by a scorn of *any* compromise to which the nefarious City could invite it, I can only reply that, as a lover, always of romantic phenomena, and an inveterate seeker for them, I should have been deprived, by the action of that particular virtue, of the thrilled sense of a society dancing, all consciously, on the thin crust of a volcano. It is the thinness of the crust that makes, in such examples, the wild fantasy, the gay bravery, of the dance—just as I admit that a preliminary, an original, extinction of the volcano would have illustrated another kind of virtue. The crust, for the social tread, would in this case have been firm, but the spectator's imagination would have responded less freely, I think, to the appeal of the scene. If I may indeed speak my whole thought for him, he would so have had to drop again, to his regret, the treasure of a small analogy picked up on its very threshold.

How shall he confess at once boldly and shyly enough that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

situation had at the end of a very short time begun to strike him, for all its immeasurably reduced and simplified form, as a much nearer approach to the representation of an "old order," of an *ancien régime,* socially speaking, than any the field of American manners had seemed likely to regale him with? Grotesque the comparison, if pushed; yet how had he encountered the similitude if it hadn't been hanging about? From the moment he adopted it, at any rate, he found it taking on touch after touch. The essence of old orders, as history lights them, is just that innocent beatitude of consanguinity, of the multiplication of the assured felicities, to which I have already alluded. From this, in Philadelphia, didn't the rest follow?—the sense, for every one, of being in the same boat with every one else, a closed circle that would find itself happy enough if only it could remain closed enough. The boat might considerably pitch, but its occupants would either float merrily together or (almost as merrily) go down together, and meanwhile the risk, the vague danger, the jokes to be made about it, the general quickened sociability and intimacy, were the very music of the excursion. There are even yet to be observed, about the world, fragments and ghosts of old social orders, thin survivals of final cataclysms, and it was not less positive than beguiling that the common marks by which these companies are known, and which we still distinguish through their bedimmed condition, cropped up for me in the high American light, making good my odd parallel at almost every point. Yet if these signs of a slightly congested, but still practically self-sufficing, little world were all there, they were perhaps there most, to my ear, in the fact of the little world's proper intimate idiom and accent; a dialect as much its very own, even in drawing-rooms and libraries, as the Venetian is that of Venice or the Neapolitan is that of Naples—representing the common things of association, the things easily understood and felt, and charged as no other vehicle could be with the fund of local reference. There is always the difference, of course, that at Venice and at Naples, "in society" an alternative,—either that of French or of the classic, the more or less academic, Italian,—is offered to the uninitiated stranger, whereas in Philadelphia he is candidly, consistently, sometimes almost contagiously, entertained in the free vernacular. The latter may easily become, in fact, under its wealth of idiosyncrasy and if he have the favoring turn of mind, a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tempting object of linguistic study; with the bridge built for him, moreover, that, unlike the Venetian, the Neapolitan, and most other local languages, it contains, itself, colloquially, a notable element of the academic and classic. It struck me even, truly, as, with a certain hardness in it, *constituting* the society that employed it—very much as the egg is made oval by its shell; and really, if I may say all, as taking its stand a bit consciously sometimes, if not a bit defiantly, on its own proved genius. I remember the visible dismay of a gentleman, a pilgrim from afar, in a drawing-room, at the comment of a lady, a lady of one of the new generations, indeed, and mistress of the tone by which I had here and there occasion to observe that such ornaments of the new generation might be known. "Listen to the creature: he speaks English!"—it was the very opposite of the indulgence or encouragement with which, in a Venetian drawing-room (I catch my analogies as I can), the sound of French or of Italian might have been greeted. The poor "creature's" dismay was so visible, clearly, for the reason that such things have only to be said with a certain confidence to create a certain confusion—the momentary consciousness of some such misdeed, from the point of view of manners, as the speaking of Russian at Warsaw. I have said that Philadelphia didn't bristle, but the heroine of my anecdote caused the so genial city to resemble, for the minute, linguistically, an unreconciled Poland.

III.

But why do I talk of the new generations, or at any rate of the abyss in them that may seem here and there beyond one's shallow sounding, when, all the while, at the back of my head, hovers the image in the guise of which antiquity, in Philadelphia, looks most seated and most interesting? Nowhere throughout the country, I think, unless it be perchance at Mount Vernon, does our historic past so enjoy the felicity of an "important" concrete illustration. It survives there in visible form as it nowhere else survives, and one can doubtless scarce think too largely of what its mere felicity of presence, in these conditions, has done, and continues, and will continue, to do for the place at large. It may seem witless enough, at this time of day, to arrive from Pennsylvania with "news" of the old State House, and my news, I can only recognize, began but with being news for myself—in which character it quite shamelessly pretended both to freshness and to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brilliancy. Why *shouldn't* it have been charming, the high roof under which the Declaration of Independence had been signed?—that was, of course, a question that might from the first have been asked of me, and with no better answer in wait for it than that, after all, it might just have happened, in the particular conditions, not to be; or else that, in general, one is allowed a margin, on the spot, for the direct sense of consecrated air, for that communication of its spirit which, in proportion as the spirit has been great, withholds itself, shyly and nobly, from any mere forecast. This it is, exactly, that, by good fortune, keeps up the sanctity of shrines and the lessons of history, to say nothing of the freshness of individual sensibility and the general continuity of things. There is positively nothing of Independence Hall, of its fine old Georgian amplitude and decency, its large serenity and symmetry of pink and drab, and its actual emphasis of detachment from the vulgar brush of things, that is *not* charming; and there is nothing, the city through, that doesn't receive a mild side light of a reflected interest from its neighborhood.

This element of the reflected interest, and more particularly of the reflected distinction, is for the most part, on the American scene, the missed interest—despite the ingenuities of wealth and industry and "energy" that strain so touchingly often, and even to grimace and contortion, somehow to supply it. One finds one's self, when it *has* happened to intervene, weighing its action to the last grain of gold. One even puts to one's self fantastic cases—such as the question, for instance, of what might, what might *not,* have happened if poor dear reckless New York had been so distinguished or so blest—with the bad conscience she is too intelligent not to have, her power to be now and then ashamed of her "form," lodged, after all, somewhere in her interminable boots. One has, of course, to brush away there the prompt conviction that the blessing—that of the possession of an historical monument of the first order—would long since have been replaced by the higher advantage of a row of sky-scrapers yielding rents; yet the imagination, none the less, dallies with the fond vision of some respect somehow instilled, some deference somehow suggested, some revelation of the possibilities of a public *tenue* somehow effected. Fascinating in fact to speculate a little as to what a New York held in respect by something or other, some power not of the purse, might have become. It is bad, ever, for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lusty youth, especially with a command of means, to grow up without knowing at least one "nice family"—if the family be not priggish; and this is the danger that the young Philadelphia, with its eyes on the superior connection I am speaking of, was enabled to escape. The charming old pink and drab heritage of the great time was to be the superior connection, playing, for the education of the place, the part of the nice family. Socially, morally, even æsthetically, the place was to be thus more or less inevitably built round it; but for which good fortune who knows if even Philadelphia too might have not been vulgar? One meets throughout the land enough instances of the opposite luck—the situation of immense and "successful" communities that have lacked, originally, anything "first rate," as they might themselves put it, to be built round; anything better, that is, than some profitable hole in the earth, some confluence of rivers or command of lakes or railroads: and one sees how, though this deficiency may not have made itself felt at first, it has inexorably loomed larger and larger, the drawback of it growing all the while with the growth of the place. Our sense of such predicaments, for the gatherings of men, comes back, I think, and with an intensity of interest, to our sense of the way the human imagination absolutely declines everywhere to go to sleep without some apology, at least, for a supper. The collective consciousness, in however empty an air, gasps for a relation, as intimate as possible, to something superior, something as central as possible, from which it may more or less have proceeded and round which its life may revolve—and its dim desire is always, I think, to do it justice, that this object or presence shall have had as much as possible an heroic or romantic association. But the difficulty is that in these later times, among such aggregations, the heroic and romantic elements, even under the earliest rude stress, have been all too tragically obscure, have belonged to smothered, unwritten, almost unconscious private history: so that the central something, the social *point de repère,* has had to be extemporized rather pitifully after the fact, and made to consist of the biggest hotel or the biggest common school, the biggest factory, the biggest newspaper-office, or, for climax of desperation, the house of the biggest billionaire. These are the values resorted to in default of higher, for with *some* colored rag or other the general imagination, snatching its chance, must dress its doll.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As a real, a moral value, to the general mind, at all events, and not as a trumped-up one, I saw the lucky legacy of the past, at Philadelphia, operate; though I admit that these are at best, for the mooning observer, matters of appreciation, mysteries of his own sensibility. Such an observer has early to perceive, and to conclude on it once for all, that there will be little for him in the American scene unless he be ready, anywhere, everywhere, to read "into" it as much as he reads out. It is at its best for him when most open to that friendly penetration, and not at its best, I think, when practically most closed to it. And yet how can I pretend to be able to say, under this discrimination, what was better and what was worse in Independence Hall?—to say how far the charming facts struck me as going of themselves, or where the imagination (perhaps on this sole patch of ground, by exception, a meddler "not wanted anyhow") took them up to carry them further. I am reduced, doubtless, to the comparative sophism of making my better sense here consist but of my sense of the fine interior of the building. One sees them immediately as "good," delightfully good, on architectural and scenic lines, these large, high, wainscoted chambers, as good as any could thinkably have been at the time; embracing what was to be done in them with such a noble congruity, as they were luckily no mere tent pitched for the purpose (which in all the conditions they well-nigh might have been), that the historic imagination, reascending the centuries, almost catches them in the act of directly suggesting the celebrated *coup*. One fancies, under the high spring of the ceiling and before the great embrasured window-sashes of the principal room, some clever man of the period, after a long look round, taking the hint. "*What* an admirable place for a Declaration of something! What could one here—what *couldn't* one really declare?" And then after a moment: "I say, why not our Independence?—capital thing always to declare, and before any one gets in with anything tactless. You'll see that the fortune of the place will be made." It really takes some such frivolous fancy as that to represent with proper extravagance the reflection irresistibly rising there and that it yet would seem pedantic to express with solemnity: the sense, namely, of our beautiful escape in not having had to "declare" in any way meanly, of our good fortune in having found half the occasion made to our hand.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

High occasions consist of many things, and it was extraordinary luck for our great date that not one of these, even as to surface and appearance, should have been wanting. There might easily have been traps laid for us by some of the inferior places, but I am convinced (and more completely than of anything else in the whole connection) that the genius of historic decency would have kept us enslaved rather than have seen us committed to one of those. In that light, for the intelligent pilgrim, the Philadelphia monument becomes, under his tread, under the touch of his hand and the echo of his voice, the very prize, the sacred thing itself, contended for and gained; so that its quality, in fine, is irresistible, and its dignity not to be uttered. I was so conscious, for myself, I confess, of the intensity of this perception that I dip deep into the whole remembrance without touching bottom; by which I mean that I grope, reminiscentially, in the full basis of the general experience of the spot without bringing up a detail. Distinct to me only the way its character, so clear yet so ample, everywhere hangs together and keeps itself up; distinct to me only the large sense, in halls and spreading staircase and long-drawn upper gallery, of one of those rare precincts of the past against which the present has kept beating in vain. The present comes in and stamps about and very stertorously breathes, but its sounds are as naught the next moment; it is as if one felt there that the grandparent, reserved, irresponsive now, and having spoken his word, in his finest manner, once for all, must have long ago had enough of the exuberance of the young grandson's modernity. But, of course, the great impression is that of the persistent actuality of the so auspicious room in which the Signers saw their tossing ship into port. The lapse of time, here, extraordinarily, has sprung no leak in the effect; it remains so robust that everything lives again, the interval drops out and we mingle in the business: the old ghosts, to our inward sensibility, still make the benches creak, as they free their full coat-skirts for sitting down, still make the temperature rise, the pens scratch, the papers flutter, the dust float in the large sun-shafts; we place them as they sit, watch them as they move, hear them as they speak, pity them as they ponder, know them, in fine, from the arch of their eyebrows to the shuffle of their shoes.

I am not sure indeed that, for mere archaic insolence, the little old Hall of the Guild of Carpenters, my vision of which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jostles my memory of the State House, does not carry it even with a higher hand—in spite of a bedizzenment of restoration, within, which leads us to rejoice that the retouchings of the greater monument expose themselves comparatively so little. The situation of this elegant structure—of dimensions and form that scarce differ, as I recall them, from those of delicate little Holden Chapel, of the so floridly overlaid gable, most articulate single word, in College Yard, of the small builded sense of old Harvard—comes nearer to representing an odd town-nook than any other corner of American life that I remember; American life having been organized, *ab ovo,* with an hostility to the town-nook which has left no scrap of provision for eyes needing on occasion a refuge from the general glare. The general glare seemed to me, at the end of something like a passage, in the shade of something like a court, and in the presence of something like a relic, to have mercifully intermitted, on that fine Philadelphia morning; I won't answer for the exact correspondence of the conditions with my figure of them, since the shade I speak of may have been but the shade of "tall" buildings, the vulgarest of new accidents. Yet I let my impression stand, if only as a note of the relief certain always to lurk, at any turn of the American scene, in the appearance of any individual thing within or behind, or at the end, or in the depths of, any other individual thing. It makes for the sense of complexity, relieves the eternal impression of things all in a row and of a single thickness, an impression which the usual unprecedented length of the American alignment (always its source of pride) does by itself little to mitigate. Nothing in the array is "behind" anything else—an odd result, I admit, of the fact that so many things affirm themselves as preponderantly before. Little Carpenters' Hall *was,* delightfully, somewhere behind; so much behind, as I perhaps thus fantastically see it, that I dare say I should not be able to find my way to it again if I were to try. Nothing, for that matter, would induce me to revisit in fact, I feel, the object I so fondly evoke. It might have been, for this beautiful posteriority, somewhere in the City of London.

IV.

I can but continue to lose myself, for these connections, in my *whole* sense of the intermission, as I have called it, of the glare. The mellower light prevailed, somehow, *all* that fine Philadelphia

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

morning, as well as on two or three other occasions—and I cannot, after all, pretend I don't now see why. It was because one's experience of the place had become immediately an intimate thing—intimate with that intimacy that I had tasted, from the first, in the local air; so that, inevitably, thus, there was no keeping of distinct accounts for public and private items. An ancient church or two, of aspect as Anglican still as you please, and taking, for another case, from the indifferent bustle round it, quite the look of Wren's mere steepled survivals in the backwaters of London churchyards; Franklin's grave itself, in its own backwater of muffled undulations, close to the indifferent bustle; Franklin's admirable portrait, *a fortiori* in the council-room of an ancient, opulent Trust, a conservative Company, vague and awful to my shy sense, that was housed after the fashion of some exclusive, madeira-drinking old gentleman with obsequious heirs; these and other matters, wholly thrilling at the time, float back to me as on the current of talk and as in the flood, so to speak, of hospitality. If Philadelphia had, in opposition to so many other matters, struck me as coherent, there would be surely no point of one's contact at which this might so have come home as in those mysterious chambers and before the most interesting of the many far-scattered portraits of Franklin—the sight of it acting as some sudden glimpse of the fine old incised seal, kept in its glass cabinet, that had originally stamped all over, for identification, the comparatively soft local wax. One thinks of Franklin's reputation, of his authority—and however much they may have been locally contested at the time—as marking the material about him much as his name might have marked his underclothing or his pocketbooks. Small wonder one had the impression of a Society, with such a figure as that to start conversation. He seemed to preside over it all while one lingered there, as if he had been seated, at the mahogany, relentingly enough, beside his glass of madeira; seemed to be "in" it even more freely than by the so interesting fact of his still having, in Philadelphia, in New York, in Boston, through his daughter, so numerous a posterity. The sense of life, life the most positive, most human and most miscellaneous, expressed in his aged, crumpled, canny face, where the smile wittily profits, for fineness, by the comparative collapse of the mouth, represents a suggestion which succeeding generations may well have found it all they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could do to work out. It is impossible, in the place, after seeing that portrait, not to feel him still with them, with the genial generations—even though to-day, in the larger, more mixed cup, the force of his example may have suffered some dilution.

It was a savor of which, at any rate, for one's own draught, one could but make the most; and I went so far, on this occasion, as fairly to taste it there in the very quality of my company—in that of the distinguished guidance and protection I was enjoying: which could only make me ask myself in what finer modern form one would have wished to see Franklin's humanity and sagacity, his variety and ingenuity, his wealth of ideas and his tireless application of them, embodied. There was verily nothing to do, after this, but to play over the general picture that light of his assumption of the general ease of things—of things at any rate thereabouts; so that I now see each reminiscence, whatever the time or the place, happily governed and colored by it. Times and places, in such an experience, range themselves, after a space, like valued objects in one of the assorted rooms of a "collection." Keep them a little, tenderly handled, wrapped up, stowed away, and they come forth, into the room swept and garnished, susceptible of almost any pleasing arrangement. The only thing is that you shall scarce know, at a given moment, amid your abundance, which of them to take up first; there being always in them, moreover, at best, the drawback of value from mere association, that keepsake element of objects in a reliquary. Is not this, however, the drawback for exhibition of almost any item of American experience that may not pretend to deal with the mere monstrosities?—the immensities of size and space, of trade and traffic, of organization political, educational, economic. From the moment one's record is not, in fine, a loud statistical shout, it falls into the order of those shy things that speak, at the most (when one is one's self incapable even of the merest statistical whisper), but of the personal adventure—in other words, but of one's luck and of one's sensibility. There are incidents, there are passages, that flush, in this fashion, to the backward eye, under the torch. But what solemn statement is one to make of the "importance," for example, of such a matter as the Academy soirée (as they say in London) of the Philadelphia winter, the festive commemoration of some long span of life achieved by the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts? We may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been thrilled, positively, by the occasion, by the interesting encounters and discoveries, artistic and personal, to which it ministered; we may have moved from one charmed recognition to another, noting Sargents and Whistlers by the dozen, and old forgotten French friends, foreign friends in general, older and younger, noting young native upstarts, creatures of yesterday and to-morrow, who invite, with all success, a stand and a stare; but no after-sense of such vibrations, however lively, presumes to take itself as communicable.

One would regret, on the other hand, failing to sound some echo of a message everywhere in the United States so audible; that of the clamorous signs of a hungry social growth, the very pulses, making all their noise, of the engine that works night and day for a theory of civilization. There are moments at which it may well seem that, putting the sense of the spectacle even at its lowest, there is no such amusement as this anywhere supplied: the air through which everything shows is so transparent, with steps and stages and processes as distinct in it as the appearance, from a street corner, of a crowd rushing, on an alarm, to a fire. The gregarious crowd "tells," in the street, and the indications I speak of tell, like chalk-marks, on the demonstrative American blackboard—an impression perhaps never so much brought home to me as by a wondrous Sunday morning at the edge of a vast vacant Philadelphia street, a street not of Penn's creation and vacant of everything, but an immeasurable *bourgeois* blankness. I had turned from that scene into a friendly house that was given over, from top to toe, to a dazzling collection of pictures, amid which I felt myself catch in the very act one of the great ingurgitations of the hungry machine, and recognize as well how perfect were all the conditions for making it a case. What could have testified less, on the face of it, than the candor of the street's insignificance?—a pair of huge parted lips protesting almost to pathos their innocence of anything to say: which was exactly, none the less, where appetite had broken out and was feeding itself to satiety. Large and liberal the hospitality, remarkably rich the store of acquisition, in the light of which the whole energy of the collector showed, the knowledge, the acuteness, the audacity, the incessant watch for opportunity. These abrupt and multiplied encounters, intensities, ever so various, of individual curiosity, sound the æsthetic note sometimes with un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

precedented shrillness, and then again with the most muffled discretion. Was the note muffled or shrill, meanwhile, as I listened to it—under a fascination I fully recognized—during an hour spent in the clustered Palæstra of the University of Pennsylvania? where the winter afternoon seemed to throw itself artfully back, across the centuries, the climates, the seasons, the very faiths and codes, into the air of old Greece and the age of gymnastic glory: artfully, I rather insist, because I scarce know what fine emphasis of modernism hung about it too. I put that question, however, only to deny myself the present luxury of answering it; so thickly do the visitor's University impressions, over the land, tend to gather, and so markedly they suggest their being reported of together. I note my palæstral hour, therefore, but because it fell, through what it seemed to show me, straight into what I had conceived of the Philadelphia scheme, the happy family given up, though quite on "family" lines, to all the immediate beguilements, and activities, the art in particular of cultivating, with such gayety as might be, a brave civic blindness.

I became conscious of but one excrescence on this large smooth surface; it is true, indeed, that the excrescence was huge and affected me as demanding in some way to be dealt with. The Pennsylvania Penitentiary rears its ancient grimness, its gray towers and defensive moats (masses, at least, that uncertain memory so figures for me) in an outlying quarter which struck me as borrowing from them a vague likeness to some more or less blighted minor city of Italy or France, black Angers or dead Ferrara—yet seated on its basis of renown and wrapped in its legend of having, as the first flourishing example of the strictly cellular system, the complete sequestration of the individual prisoner, thought wonderful in its day, moved Charles Dickens to the passionate protest recorded in his "American Notes." Of such substance was the story of these battlements; yet it was unmistakable that, when one had crossed the drawbridge and passed under the portcullis, the air seemed thick enough with the breath of the generations. A prison has, at the worst, the massive majesty, the sinister peace, of a prison; but this huge house of sorrow affected me as, uncannily, of the City itself, the City of all the cynicisms and impunities against which my friends had, from far back, kept plating, as with the old silver of their side-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

boards, the armor of their social consciousness. It made the whole place, with some of its oddly antique aspects and its oddly modern freedoms, look doubly cut off from the world of light and ease. The suggestions here were vast, however; too many of them swarm, and my imagination must defend itself as it can. What one was most concerned to note was the complete turn of the wheel of fortune in respect to the measure of mere incarceration suffered, from which the worst of the rigor had visibly been drawn. Parts of the place suggested a sunny Club at a languid hour, with members vaguely lounging and chatting, with open doors and comparatively cheerful vistas, and plenty of rocking-chairs and magazines. The only thing was that, under this analogy, one found one's self speculating much on the implied requisites for membership. It was impossible not to wonder, from face to face, what these would have been, and not to ask what one would have taken them to be, if the appearance of a Club had been a little more complete. I almost blush, I fear, for the crude comfort of my prompt conclusion. One would have taken them to consist, without exception, of full-blown basenesses; one couldn't, from member to member, from type to type, from one pair of eyes to another, take them for anything less. Where was the victim of circumstances, where the creature merely misled or betrayed? He fitted no type, he suffered in no face, he yearned in no history, and one felt, the more one took in his absence, that the numerous substitutes for him were good enough for each other.

The great interest was in this sight of the number and variety of ways of looking morally mean; and perhaps also in the question of how much the effect came from its being proved upon them, of how little it might have come if they had still been out in the world. Considered as criminals, the moral meanness, here, was their explication. Considered as morally mean, therefore, would possible criminality, out in the world, have been in the same degree their sole sense? Was the fact of prison *all* the mere fact of opportunity, and the fact of freedom all the mere fact of the absence of it? One inclined to believe that the simplification was at any rate so great for one's feeling; the cases presented became thus, consistently, cases of the vocation, and from the moment this was clear the place took on, in its way, almost the harmony of a convent. I talked for a long time with a charming reprieved murderer, whom I half expected, at any moment,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to see ring for coffee and cigars; he explained with all urbanity, and with perfect lucidity, the real sense of the appearances against him, but I none the less felt sure that his merit was largely in the refinement wrought in him by so many years of easy club life. He was as natural a subject for commutation as for conviction, and had had to have the latter in order to have the former —in the enjoyment, and indeed in the subtle criticism, of which, *as* simple commutation, he was at his best. They were there, all those of his companions I was able to note, unmistakably at their best. One could, as I say, sufficiently rest in it, and to do that kept, in a manner, the excrescence, as I have called it, on the general scene, within bounds. I was moreover, luckily, to see the general scene definitely cleared again, cleared of everything save its own social character and its practical philosophy—and at no moment with these features so brightly presented as during a few days' rage of winter round an old country house. The house was virtually distant from town, and the conditions could but strike any visitor who stood as much as possible with his back to the fire, where the logs were piled high, as made to press on all the reserves and traditions of the general temperament, those of gallantry, hilarity, social disposability, crowned with the grace of the sporting instinct. What was it confusedly, almost romantically, like, what "old order" commemorated in fiction and anecdote? I had groped for this, as I have shown, before, but I found myself at it again. Wasn't it, for freedom of movement, for jingle of sleigh-bells, for breasting of the elements, for cross-country drives in the small hours, for *crânerie* of fine young men and high wintry color of muffled nymphs, wasn't it, brogue and all, like some audible echo of close-packing, chancing Irish society of the classic time, seen and heard through a roaring blizzard? That, at least, with his back to the fire, was where the restless analyst was landed.

HENRY JAMES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CANADA'S TARIFF MOOD TOWARDS THE UNITED STATES.

BY EDWARD PORRITT.

FROM the beginning of September, 1905, until the second week in February, three members of the Laurier Cabinet at Ottawa—Mr. H. S. Fielding, Minister of Finance, Mr. W. Paterson, Minister of Customs, and Mr. L. P. Brodeur, Minister of Inland Revenue—were organized as a Commission to ascertain public feeling in Canada with regard to the new tariff which is to be enacted in the 1906 session of the Dominion Parliament. These Ministers, with some assistance from other members of the Laurier Cabinet, will frame the schedules of the new tariff. It will then be presented to the House of Commons by Mr. Fielding; and, as the Liberal Government has an overwhelming majority in the House, the bill will become law practically in the shape determined by Messrs. Fielding, Brodeur and Paterson.

Neither in this country nor in Canada was there ever before anything quite like the public hearings which have preceded this Canadian tariff of 1906. In the old days at Ottawa—in the days when Sir John Macdonald and the Tories were in power, from 1879 to 1896—tariff schedule details were settled largely at what were known as the "Red Parlor Conferences" at Toronto. There the manufacturers had their interviews with the Tory Premier; and Canadians generally knew little about the tariff, or the reasons for changes in the tariff, until the bill was submitted to the House of Commons. Even then they had to be satisfied with such reasons for changes as were put forward by the Tory Minister of Finance in his Budget speech.

The Liberals came into power in 1896, after having been continuously in Opposition at Ottawa from 1879. They were pledged to Tariff Reform. As a matter of fact they had gone into the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Election of 1896 on the Ottawa Liberal Programme of 1894, which committed the Liberal party to a tariff for revenue only. They did not act on the Ottawa Programme in 1897 when the tariff was revised. Many of the schedules of the old Tory tariff were so rearranged as to give Canadian manufacturers increased protection against the United States; and the only absolutely new departure in the tariff of 1897 was the British Preference—the system under which imports from Great Britain and from the British Colonies pay only two-thirds of the duties imposed by the general tariff.

But the revision of the tariff in 1897 was preceded by a noteworthy and commendable innovation. Then, as in the case of the revision which is now in progress, three members of the Laurier Cabinet were organized as a Commission of inquiry, and held public hearings in Toronto, Montreal and several other large cities. After the revision of 1897 it was complained that, while this innovation was good, public hearings had not been held in a sufficiently large number of towns and cities to enable the Commissioners to ascertain with anything approximating certainty the general state of feeling in the Dominion on the fiscal policy. It was chiefly the farmers who made this complaint. They insisted that, while due care had been had to the convenience of the manufacturers who derived advantages from the tariff, no opportunities had been afforded to the farmers, on whom fell the burden of the protective system.

Due note was taken of the complaints that followed the tariff revision of 1896-97; and in 1905-6 the Tariff Commission so organized its work, and went so widely afield, that opportunity was afforded to every man in Canada—farmer, importer or manufacturer—to make his representations either as to changes in duties, or as to the fiscal policy of the Dominion in general.

Representative institutions and democratic government were surely never seen at work under better or more wholesome conditions than in connection with these hearings of the Tariff Commission. The Commission went to the people. It began on the Pacific Coast in the early days of September, 1905, and worked its way across the continent from Vancouver and Victoria to St. John, Charlottetown, Sydney, and Halifax, where its hearings came to an end on the 30th of January. The Commission had to zigzag across the continent; often to double back in its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

journeys. The Ministers spent most of their nights on a railway car, equipped to serve both as a home and an office; and in fulfilment of their policy of giving everybody interested an opportunity of a hearing, they travelled fourteen thousand miles, and held sessions in between fifty and sixty towns.

All the sessions were open to the public, and due notice that they were open, and that everybody was entitled to a hearing, was given in advance—sometimes by poster, sometimes by advertisement in the local press—in every town and city that the Commission visited. Reporters and newspaper correspondents were in attendance at every session. Any man who cared to send in his name to the Secretary of the Commission, that it might be entered on the schedule of petitioners, was given a hearing. An American appearing before the Commission had only—like a Canadian—to produce his typewritten statement or petition; read it to the Commissioners; and then submit, just like the Canadian witnesses, to a pretty searching examination and cross-examination from the Commissioners' side of the table.

Early in the long tour there were witnesses who would have liked to talk with the Commissioners in private; and other witnesses who desired to submit data in confidence. But, when a witness was disposed to lower his voice, and talk only for the ear of the Commissioners, he was promptly told by Mr. Fielding, the President of the Commission, to speak up, so that the newspaper correspondents might hear; and, except as regards such matters as actual workshop costs, which were only very occasionally offered, the Commissioners refused to accept any confidential data. These open-door methods added enormously to the work of the Commission; as manufacturers who were assailed at one town turned up at another with statements in rebuttal.

High-protectionist manufacturers urging more protection against the United States and Great Britain; farmer deputations anxious to bring the Liberal party in Canada back to its policy of Opposition days of a "tariff for revenue only"; academic free-traders; advocates of single tax; and supporters and opponents of Chamberlain's propaganda for inter-Imperial trade based on a return to the protective system in Britain—all availed themselves of the sessions of the Commission; and in some cities the pressure of work was so great that the sessions were prolonged until midnight.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Members of the Hansard Corps at Ottawa accompanied the Commission all through its tour. A *verbatim* shorthand note was taken of all the petitions, and of the discussions which followed the petitions. Five typewritten copies of the transcript of these notes are now in existence. Printed in any one of the New York morning newspapers the transcript would need two thousand columns for its reproduction. Granted that much is said at all tariff hearings that is not so, it is none the less true that these notes are of enormous permanent value. They have been described as a Domesday Book for Canada; and they certainly are replete with first-hand information as to the industrial and social conditions of the Dominion in the opening years of the twentieth century—of the century which Sir Wilfrid Laurier has publicly predicted is to belong to Canada.

Before dealing with the significance of the Tariff Revision of 1805-6 as it concerns the United States, Canada and Great Britain, a few words are necessary as to why the tariff question was reopened. Canada is obviously prospering under the tariff of 1897, notwithstanding the preference which it gives to Great Britain. Canada's prosperity is the central fact in the Domesday Book to which I have referred. There is, however, in the Dominion an organization with widely extended ramifications known as the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. This association has never liked the British preference; and ever since the Dingley Act came into force it has been agitating for a Canadian tariff patterned in every schedule and in every detail on the Dingley model. "Dingley rates all through the tariff, and retaliation against the United States at every possible point," was the slogan of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association from about 1900 to 1904. The Association got the Tory politicians at Ottawa on its side; and scores of newspapers all over Canada—some avowedly Tory and some not—danced to its piping.

The movement grew in strength—or, rather, it was so dexterously worked that it appeared to grow; and the result was that, at the Dominion General Election in 1904, the Laurier Government gave a pledge that the tariff should be revised in the Parliamentary session of 1906. By this time—that is, at the end of the tariff hearings by the Commission—the Manufacturers' Association doubtless wishes that it had let well alone; for the tariff hearings have developed among the farmers in every Province

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Canada a strong movement against any additional protection to Canadian manufacturers, and an equally strong sentiment in favor of the British preference that was established in 1897.

Farmers all over Canada—in the Province of Quebec, as well as in the Provinces where the farming population is of English and Scotch origin—were enthusiastic in support of the British preference, and that for three well-defined reasons. First, they regarded it as a valuable sentimental tie to the Old Country; second, it affords them some relief from high duties in the tariff intended to protect Canadian manufacturers; and, third, by developing a larger westward trade between British ports and the ports of Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John, it tends to cheapen ocean transport charges on farm products which are exported from Canada to Great Britain.

The strength of the popular movement in favor of the preference was one of the disagreeable surprises in the tariff hearings for the Canadian Manufacturers' Association; and another *contre-temps* for the Association came when the Commission happened to hold a week's session in Toronto just at the time that the Provincial Crown Prosecutor there discovered that in Ontario there were seventy combines in restraint of trade, and instituted proceedings against many of them in the criminal courts.

This was really a tragic mishap for the Canadian Manufacturers' Association; for, at every hearing before the Tariff Commission up to that time, manufacturing witnesses who appeared to ask for more protection, alike against the United States and Great Britain, had invariably given the Commission the assurance that there was sufficiently keen competition within the domestic industry to prevent prices from being advanced, if the higher duties they asked were conceded. "All we want," these witnesses had repeatedly told the Commission, "is to secure the trade that now goes to the United States or to Great Britain." "We have no intention," they usually added, "of raising prices"; while, as to combines, they had heard that these existed in the United States, but there were surely none in Canada!

Many of these witnesses may have been speaking sincerely; but, as the result of the Toronto exposures, and of the petitions which were submitted to the Commission in that city, it is almost certain that in the tariff of 1906 there will be a clause constituting a new bureau in the Customs Department at Ottawa.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Its chief will be a lawyer; and it will be his statutory duty to conduct, at the public expense, prosecutions of combines, under the clause in the existing tariff, which makes it possible by Order-in-Council—that is practically by resolution of the Dominion Cabinet—to withdraw the protection that any industry enjoys under the tariff, when it has been proved in the courts that a combine exists, that competition is at an end, and that prices are being forced up and maintained at the tariff limit. As the clause now stands, it rests with John Doe or any other man willing to incur the expense to prove in the courts that a combine has brought itself within the reach of the anti-combine clause; and the expense and the risks are so great that, although the anti-combine clause has been part of the Dominion tariff since 1898, the paper trade is the only interest against which an Order-in-Council withdrawing favors has ever gone into operation.

Before the strong movement against higher duties had developed on the part of the farmers, and before the exposures of the combines at Toronto and Hamilton, the Manufacturers' Association had been told most definitely by the Commission that no heed would be given to the demands for Dingley rates, and that the Commission would not favor a policy of retaliation against the United States. The members of the Manufacturers' Association came before the commission in sections. Sometimes they appeared as the representatives of particular trades or industries. At other places they appeared as the representatives of the Provincial organizations of the Association. This was the case at the city of Quebec; and again at St. John. No matter in what capacity the members appeared, they almost invariably asked for higher duties against imports both from the United States and from Great Britain; and usually retaliation against the United States was part of their request. This was especially so at St. John, New Brunswick, where the feeling against the Dingley Act was more bitter than at any other city in which the Commission held its sessions. Dingley rates and retaliation were so strongly pressed at St. John that there Mr. Fielding felt called upon to explain why the Commission would give no sanction to either plea. It was a short and epigrammatic explanation, as Mr. Fielding's pronouncements usually were. He told the New Brunswick section of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association that to adopt Dingley rates would simplify matters enormously for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Commission, and make the revision of the Canadian tariff an easy matter; but that the result of such a policy would inevitably be that the Canadian tariff would be framed, not at Ottawa, but at Washington.

The Canadian Manufacturers' Association assailed the British preference with almost as much vigor and persistence as it did the Dingley Act—only to be told, however, from the Commissioners' side of the table, that the preference was to stand; that it was to be greatly extended; and that, as the Government realized the enormous value which the sentimental preference for Canadian produce in Great Britain had been to the Dominion export trade, it was one of the objects of the Commission to ascertain how, by changes in the Canadian tariff, a return could be made to Great Britain for this preference for Canadian produce.

It is in connection with this extension of the British preference that the Canadian Tariff Revision of 1906 has most significance for the ports and railways and the manufacturers of the United States. Remarks like those I have quoted, dropped from time to time from the Commissioners at these tariff hearings, make it clear that in the new tariff the British preference is to be so rearranged as to make it obviously to the advantage of two distinct sets of Canadian business and industrial interests to buy in Great Britain rather than in the United States or Germany. Importers handling manufactured goods which are not made in Canada, and which are not likely to be made there for some time to come, are to be encouraged by low duties—duties which are likely to be on a basis of a tariff for revenue only—to obtain them in Great Britain; and Canadian manufacturers engaged in secondary industries are to be similarly encouraged to import their raw material, which is often the finished product of other manufacturers, from England or Scotland rather than, as now, from the United States.

Changes in the free list, as well as in the dutiable schedules, will be necessary to these ends; and, although for a little while these changes will dislocate many Canadian industries, and throw certain lines of industry out of their accustomed channels, I feel that I am hazarding very little when I predict that these changes in the free list and in the schedules will be made in the tariff of 1906. The Ottawa Government is obviously bent on throwing as much as practicable of the import trade of the Dominion into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British hands. It has always known that the preference of 1897 has made the Laurier Government immensely popular in England; that it has made the year 1897 one of good import in the history of the British Empire; and that, as a result of the bold departure then made, Canada has ever since been the most popular, and by far the best advertised of all the British oversea possessions.

The Ottawa Government also now knows that the preference is extremely popular with all but the manufacturing interests in Canada; that the farming population, which has profited most by the British sentimental preference for Canadian agricultural products, is overwhelmingly in favor of the Canadian preference for Great Britain. In 1897, when Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding made what might not inaptly be described as "a leap in the dark," and surprised equally Canada and Great Britain by a preferential tariff for Great Britain, the Government could only conjecture that the people of Canada would commend the new departure. They did commend it at two General Elections —in 1900 and 1904—by returning the Liberals to power with largely increased majorities in the Dominion House of Commons; and, moreover, the hearings before the Tariff Commission have since then proved manifestly and abundantly that the British preference is immensely popular all over rural Canada. With the support of rural Canada behind it, and urging it forward as a Government was never before urged forward in any line of policy, the Laurier Government in the new tariff will do all that is practicable to bring Canada and Great Britain into still closer trade relationship. It will do this altogether independently of the recent fate of Mr. Chamberlain's propaganda; because the preference of 1897 has been of even greater value to Canada than to Great Britain, and because this preference has greatly strengthened the sentimental ties between the Dominion and the Old Country; and has strengthened them, it should be noted, without throwing the least strain on the people of Great Britain, or causing any of the dangerous friction that must inevitably and immediately have resulted had any serious attempt been made to establish closer inter-Imperial trade relations, on the lines which the British electorate has so recently repudiated.

There will be some agreeable surprises for Great Britain in the preferential clauses of the new tariff; and, consequently, a new and keen interest will be awakened in Great Britain in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

extended trade opportunities which are soon to be offered in Canada. These clauses may have also some surprises for American ports and American railways—surprises which will be disturbing to some of these American interests. All will depend on the attitude which the Tariff Commission and the Laurier Government finally adopt towards a movement, which, when the Commission was on tour, developed its greatest strength at Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax.

In recent years, since the preference stimulated trade with Great Britain, British imports of the value of from twenty-two to twenty-five millions annually have reached Canada *viâ* Portland, Boston, New York, and other American Atlantic ports. These imports are mostly consigned to Toronto and distributing centres west of Toronto; and they follow routes which were well established long before there was any idea of preferential treatment for Great Britain. Halifax and St. John have looked with increasingly envious eyes on the shipping and transport business which this Western Canadian trade now throws to the American Atlantic ports; and just as soon as the preference was enacted, these ports began to move for such an amendment to the preference clauses as would deny the reduction in duties to all British imports which are not landed at Canadian ports. The agitation is older than that of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association for Dingley rates and retaliation. Nine out of ten of all the Boards of Trade in Canada have been induced to support the movement on the part of the Canadian ports; and, when the Tariff Commission was in the Maritime Provinces, in the early weeks of January last, no petition was pressed upon it with more zeal than the petitions in favor of amending the preferential tariff clauses in such a way as to divert the increased trade with Great Britain, due to the preference, from American ports, and so direct it that it shall mean largely increased business for Canadian steamship lines, ports and railways.

At St. John and at Halifax, as at Quebec earlier in the tour, this change in the preference tariff was pressed upon the Commission. At St. John the pressure was almost vehement; and the impatience of the partisans of the New Brunswick port for some favorable expression of opinion from the Commission was so marked that, to relieve the constraint and clear the way for the next business, Mr. Fielding intimated that, as a Maritime Prov-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ince man—he was formerly editor of the "Halifax Chronicle," and later on Premier of Nova Scotia before he joined the Laurier Government as Minister of Finance in 1896—the movement had his warmest sympathy. He cautiously added, however, that there were other sides to the question that had not come before the Commission.

This was taken to mean that, if the amendment were made, and trade diverted from American ports by a statute of the Dominion Parliament, the bonding privilege now long enjoyed by both Canadian and American railways might be endangered by action at Washington; and, to offset this apprehended danger, the statement was made by the eager supporters of the amendment that it was only necessary to turn to the figures to realize that the bonding privilege is of much greater value to American than to Canadian railways. The Commissioners were more non-committal on this disturbing issue than on almost any other question which came before them. What policy the Laurier Government will finally decide upon will not be known until Mr. Fielding submits the new tariff to the House of Commons. If there are no changes in the direction urged, and if, as is practically certain, the new tariff is so framed as to add to the volume of British imports, there will be much heart-burning and keen disappointment along the Canadian Atlantic seaboard, from St. Andrew and St. Stephen on the St. Croix River to Quebec and Montreal on the St. Lawrence.

While there are to be no Dingley rates and no retaliation against the United States, and while the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, as a whole, is to gain little by the revision, there are some aggressive American industrial interests which are likely to find themselves hurt by the new tariff. What Canada can do for or against the United States Steel Corporation is, after all, a small matter for such a gigantic concern. But the Steel Corporation's attitude towards the billet, steel rod, wire and nail industries in Canada has brought it into much ill odor. Canadians resent the threats of the Steel Corporation, as exposed before the Commission at St. John, to wipe out the nail industry there; and they also resent the terms on which it, or an allied concern, parcels out the wire business of the Dominion; and as just now the Canadian steel industry—the manufacture of rails and wire rods—is showing more vitality than at any previous

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time in the industrial history of Canada, changes in the tariff which will stimulate these lines of industry, and dislodge the Steel Corporation from its hold on Canadian business, will meet with popular approval.

The change will be all the more popular if, as is probable, the dislodgment of the United States Steel Corporation is effected by clauses in the tariff which will throw part of the business hitherto controlled by the Steel Corporation to plants located in the north of England or in Scotland. Such a diversion of trade will be popular in Canada for another reason. It will add to the volume of westward freights from Great Britain; and the preference clauses are to be framed with this end in view, as well as to divert trade from the United States to Great Britain.

Other American interests likely to be adversely affected, not by retaliatory legislation, but by the adjustment of the Canadian tariff to Canada's needs, or to a trade policy favorable to the British Empire, are the paper industry; the publication of magazines; the American shoe trade; and the American corporations which lease machinery for service in shoe-factories.

American paper-mills are in danger from the agitation in the Province of Quebec for heavy export duties on pulp wood. The paper-manufacturers at Three Rivers originated this plea; and it also received much support elsewhere—notably at New Castle, New Brunswick,—on the ground that Canada should keep its supplies of raw material, and that if American paper-manufacturers need Canadian pulp wood they should transfer their manufacturing plants to Canada.

The danger to American popular magazines comes partly from Canadian publishers, but chiefly from Canadian manufacturers. Five or six million copies of American magazines are now sold annually in Canada. They are all loaded down with American advertising; and the case against them is that this advertising transfers an increasingly large amount of Canadian money to the United States every year; and that, as it is useless for a Canadian manufacturer to advertise in the United States, because he can make no sales with the Dingley Tariff against him, this American advertising should be excluded. The magazines cannot be excluded altogether; but the Tariff Commission received with significant commendation at Toronto a suggestion made by representatives of the Canadian Press Association, an organiza-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of newspaper and magazine publishers, that an Australian expedient should be adopted, by which heavy duties are levied on foreign magazines which carry more than ten or fifteen per cent. of advertising.

Another argument advanced before the Commission against American magazines will tell against them when the printed-matter schedules of the tariff are being finally revised. It is objected that these magazines, as well as the matter which is sent over the border from stereotyping houses and literary syndicate bureaus in various American cities, are not Empire-building in tone or character. There is a feeling also that Canada is too dependent on the United States for reading-matter; so that, if heavy duties are imposed on American magazines in the new tariff, provision will be made for encouraging English magazines which carry Empire-building reading-matter; and no English magazine will be permitted to encounter trouble at the Canadian custom-house because of the amount of British advertising that it carries.

The machinery corporations in this country which lease machinery to Canadian manufacturers are in danger for much the same reason as the United States Steel Corporation. They are regarded as aggressive and arbitrary. Most of the complaints made to the Tariff Commission under this head concerned the leasing of machinery for shoe-factories. Copies of leases of these machines were submitted to the Commission at the city of Quebec; and the attention of the Commission was specially directed to the clauses which compel lessees to buy all the wire and findings for use on the machines from the corporations leasing the machines at prices arbitrarily fixed by the corporation. These shoe-machinery corporations may expect to be hit in two ways. Higher duties—duties which will be almost prohibitive—may be imposed on the product of these machines made in American factories, now sold in large quantities in Canada; and there may be amendments to the Canadian patent laws which will have the effect of relieving Canadian hirers of these American machines from the onerous obligations into which they have now to contract themselves. Great Britain long ago amended its patent laws so as to make it impossible for the owners of patents to dictate arbitrary terms for the use of patented machinery; and Canada is likely to turn to the British statute-book to find a means of relief from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conditions such as those of which the Canadian shoe-manufacturers so grievously complained to the Tariff Commission.

Three other features of the 1905-6 tariff hearings are of much significance for Canada, and not without present interest for the United States. The protective policy of Canada is to be permanent. The Commissioners made this clear at Chatham, Ontario, when a farmers' deputation recalled the Liberal pledges of a "Tariff for Revenue Only"—the pledges of the years when the Liberals were in Opposition—and pressed for the reason why these pledges had not been implemented when the Liberals were returned to power at Ottawa in 1896. The Commission, through Mr. Paterson, the Minister of Customs, gave the reason. It was that the Government, when it came into power, could not face the responsibility of the demoralization in finance, business and industry, which must have ensued had they abandoned the protective system built up by the Tories between 1879 and 1896.

The tariff inquiry has also established the fact that reciprocity with the United States is a dead issue in Canada. Where responsibility for this lies need not be here discussed; but it may be stated that the Dingley Act killed the movement for reciprocity in Canada, and that, with the preference for Great Britain in 1897, and the sentimental preference which Great Britain has since then so markedly extended to Canada, the reciprocity movement is dead beyond all possibility of early resurrection. The Maritime Provinces were for years the stronghold of the reciprocity movement, as these Provinces had enjoyed many advantages under the old Elgin-Marcy Treaty. But, when the Tariff Commission was in the cities of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, reciprocity was not even mentioned; and, as I have stated, retaliation against the United States was more outspokenly and vigorously advocated in the Maritime Provinces than in any other part of the Dominion covered by the Tariff Commission tour.

The third fact demonstrated by the tariff hearings is that Canadian manufacturers and high protectionists generally have now well-nigh abandoned the "infant industries plea." There are not more than half a dozen infant industry appeals on the voluminous records of the Commission, if the pleas for bounties for ship-building are expected. The new plea of the Canadian manufacturers, all along the line, was that they should be given more protection in the tariff to enable them to specialize as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American manufacturers do, and also enable them, like American manufacturers, to reach out for an export business.

Great Britain had two distinct interests in the Tariff Revision —the future of the preference, and the attitude of Canada towards Mr. Chamberlain's propaganda. As I have shown, the preference is safe, and more than safe. As regards Mr. Chamberlain's scheme for the taxation of foodstuffs in Great Britain, in order that Great Britain might establish statutory as distinct from sentimental preferences for Canadian products, the records of the Commission will prove that it is as dead as the question of reciprocity with the United States. Canada is the king-pin in Mr. Chamberlain's scheme. Yet there were only three commendations of it; while the manufacturers hammered at it at every session of the Commission. They did not attack Mr. Chamberlain's scheme as such; but they hammered unmercifully at the British preference. Some of them spoke of London and Liverpool as "foreign" ports; and of Englishmen who came to Canada in search of orders for British factories as "foreigners."

In thus attacking the preference the Canadian manufacturers consciously or unconsciously struck heavily and disastrously at Mr. Chamberlain's idea of inter-Imperial trade; and no one who travelled with the Commission, and day after day sat out its sessions, as was my great privilege, nor any one who will undertake the tremendous task of reading through the transcript of the notes of the Commission, can come to any other conclusion than that the tariff hearings have demonstrated that Mr. Chamberlain's scheme is an impossibility.

It is fortunate for the Government at Ottawa that this has been demonstrated, and still more fortunate for Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues that the British electorate has so overwhelmingly repudiated Mr. Chamberlain's fiscal ideas; for, had Mr. Chamberlain been placed at the head of a Protectionist Government at Westminster, the Cabinet at Ottawa would have soon been in a more embarrassing position than any colonial government since the era of the Stamp Act and the American Revolution. Mr. Chamberlain's scheme must be based on concessions by Canada which no Canadian Government can possibly make as long as the system of protection to Canadian industries, established by Macdonald and the Tories, survives.

EDWARD PORRITT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RECENT SPECULATIONS UPON IMMORTALITY.

BY LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX.

WHENEVER the flood of life is at the full, then, too, the sense of death is most copious. It is not the sluggish nor the half-alert who, in all the inevitable round of hourly changes, feels the looming shadow of the ultimate passing as it approaches. Rather is it he who in every nerve is alive who feels most keenly the trickling by of the hours, and who strives to hold at bay the great Invader, lingering like a child upon the shore eager to cast one last pebble before the sun goes down.

The Elizabethan and the Victorian eras, both periods of resplendent vitality, have been notably preoccupied with the sense of death. If they of the earlier time sowed broadcast more magnificent and enlightening phrases, we of the later may at least claim to have been more impartial, more eager, if by any means it might be accomplished, to come at some glimmering of exact truth. The contemplative descriptions of the Elizabethan period have become treatises, in which, from all the known data of the world, men have endeavored to plummet the ocean of the unknown. The method only is different. The poets then were as eager as the scientists are now to fathom the meaning of the strange contradiction of life. The pity and terror of death, its mystery and its liberation, haunted them. Nowhere more strikingly set down is the whole awe of it than in Ferdinand's short speech over the body of his dead sister, killed by his own rapacious cruelty:

"Cover her face; mine eyes dazzle; she died young."

The solitude, the breaking off with all sweet customs of life, with "youth, strength, pleasure, people, time, nay reason"; its gruesomeness, "so full of fearful shadows"; its dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gust, "to lie in cold obstruction and to rot," this sensibly warm motion to become "a kneaded clod," "to be imprisoned in the viewless winds, and blown with restless violence about the pendent world,"—all these aspects of our evanescence haunted the imagination even as now, and at times the sense of it touched those buoyant people with a world-weariness fit to belong to the nineteenth century.

> "'Tis less than to be born, a lasting sleep;
> A quiet resting from all jealousy."

> "It is but giving over of a game
> That must be lost."

There were then, as well, those who took the scientific path and examined closely, like Sir Thomas Browne, into the minutiæ of death, modes of burial, the uses of the ashes of dead bodies, the significance and derivation of the rites performed, the contradiction of the human state where the flowing present and the imperfect image of the past are man's only possession and the future an impenetrable veil, and who found in the end that nothing was immortal but immortality, that elaborate burial was but a futile antic, that the strongest monuments crumble, and that a man has nothing to lean upon but his own faith. Drummond of Hawthornden, too, in his "Cypress Grove," strolled in meditative leisure over the whole ground; he argued the existence of the soul from those incomprehensible powers in this life that forecast disasters, see apparitions and give signs, feel secret foreknowledge and presagings. He offers it as solace that, as we do not despair in the evils of life seeing that Providence overcomes them, neither should we despair in the last and greatest of evils, death. Birth, he tells us, is a mysterious change, no less than death; all things have their season and then perish; human honors and delights are empty; desire is futile and self-deceptive; and, finally, he points out how intolerable a creature a man would be, were he not mortal, were it not for the continual renewing of the species on the earth, and for the dignity and tragedy with which his necessary passing invests each man. He, too, ends the whole matter on the note of faith:

> "This world is as a cabinet to God, in which the small things (however to us hid and secret) are nothing less keeped than the great. For as He was wise and powerful to create, so doth His knowledge com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prehend His own creation. . . . Not any atom of the scattered dust of mankind, tho' daily flowing under new forms, is to Him unknown; and His knowledge doth distinguish and discern what once His power shall awake and raise up. . . . That time doth approach in which the dead shall live and the living be changed, and of all actions the guerdon is at hand."

It is interesting to note that but little progress has been made since then. The centuries have passed, and practically little more is to be said to-day upon man's problematic future. Nearly every form of modern speculation has been forecast. Greater stress is laid in our days upon knowing the self and definitely making up one's mind as to what it is that is to be perpetuated. Only a well-knit personality, and one of definite outline, is perceptible against the shifting scenery of this world. The journey to ourselves is far to make and difficult. As in Atalanta's race, the ground is strewn with golden apples, and an irresistible desire to stoop and possess the fruits of the earth conquers us. It is all too easy to lose sight of that dazzling darkness toward which we journey. Plunging our whole being into life, consumed by the sense of generation, death, regeneration, we become of the very stuff of mortality and mutability; we miss our chance to sound the depths of consciousness, to find the point of stability and maintain the victor's attitude in the face of the everlasting flux. Life, once despoiled of its decorative garments, wavers between two points, the effort of philosophy to know and the effort of religion to feel. By one or the other of these, a man must hold himself still in a whirling universe, must learn to realize himself and possess his soul. Michael Angelo, self-centred as few men have ever been, complained at the last that on numbering over his days he could not find one which had belonged to himself. Subtract from life the time given to things bodily, sleep, food, exercise and the accumulation of money, and the time given to things casual, intercourse, public duties and pleasures, external observances and vain dissipation of energy, and the portion of life left for that solitary journey to ourselves is indeed scant. Chateaubriand once said: "Happiness is to be ignorant of self, and to arrive at death without ever having felt one's self live." But this is an exact contradiction of the truth. If it were true, the achievement of a violet would be greater than the achievement of Socrates. But the truth is, happiness is ful-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness of being, and consists in that knowledge of self which feels its own stability, its resistance to the mutability about it.

Modern literature has strained after many ways of extending and intensifying personality. Barrés, the aggressive French individualist, so representative of his class, has recommended the means of pride and of domination, totally overlooking the fact that by relations only is this life enriched. Life for him is an opportunity for pillage and booty. He vivifies all nature, adorns the memory by strange sights and sounds, courting the quickening power of unaccustomed experiences and hours,—the evening when all the flowers take on color, when contours stand out, everything lives anew and glows into speech. He seems to endow nature with spirit and an articulate organism; history he uses to extend the personality across the ages, and to incite himself to keener humility and higher pride than may belong to the single individual. Beauty, beauty ever flowing, vanishing away as we look, is to him an incitement to grasp with deeper and keener sensibility the moment of life. It is the same tendency that leads Pater to warn us, in the Conclusion to the "Renaissance," to force every instant to yield up its guerdon of quickened sensibilities and multiplied consciousness, to care for the quality of the moment as it flies; it is the same warning iterated and reiterated throughout Goethe, and which makes inevitably for the high experience of the true humanist.

This is the attitude toward life with which Mr. Santayana* is most closely allied. In his "Reason in Religion," he gives us that incisive and clean-cut representation of life which is the fruit of the penetrating power of the critical intelligence devoid of the smelting and fusing power of a spiritual experience. Mr. Santayana's plea is that the categories of reason should be applied to every department of life, and that mortality thus lifted to its highest powers would make the here and the now its own sufficient and completed reward. He is concerned to show that there is not, and never has been, any other revelation than that of the slow development of human reason. The Christian Epic, dried out and rationalized by him, loses its glow and inspiration, and it is obvious that thus presented it would cease to be a great moving power.

* "The Life of Reason—Vol. III—Reason in Religion," by George Santayana. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That religion teaches and has always taught by symbols and not by facts Mr. Santayana truly enough emphasizes, and that literal interpretation can belong only to the elementary intelligence. But where Mr. Santayana is hardly emphatic enough is in not laying stress upon the fact that who delves beneath the symbol for significance comes ultimately at a truth unfailingly vital to man in all ages. It is true enough that the average heaven presented by the old promises is no longer alluring. The heaven of the Old Testament, the city inside four walls, with its streets of gold, jewel-set portals, and its unrelieved Jewish glitter and hardness, means very little now. Modern religion can offer us no descriptive heaven which would be accepted by the sophisticated consciousness. The gold and silver and gems of the Old Testament would be comfortable only to the Jews; and the well-watered gardens where Mohammed lounges drinking sherbets and transfixed by the glances of lovely maidens " all innocence and fire," with which Mr. Santayana mirthfully expresses himself as satisfied, leave the present writer utterly untouched. The very presence of Mohammed and the gazellelike maidens, who somehow suggest a troop of giggling and unripe schoolgirls, would make it uninhabitable. As for Nirvana, that has the virtue of being vague, but it is too empty to be a real incitement to effort. The meeting again of friends in an infinity of love and bliss, which is the heaven treasured by many affectionate hearts, fails too and has its own element of crudity. In the first place, human beings are precious to us by virtue of their limitations and our own. They are dear because they share our burdens, or because in an indifferent and unlistening world they understand the secret tortures of our suffering, or because they accept our care and affection, and feel our existence as an alleviation of their own ills, and thus furnish us with an added reason for being. They are, too, the dearer for the very fact of their evanescence. All love foresees loss and suffering. All love clings closer because we foretaste and tremble at the dawning division. In a world where there was no suffering, no prospect of change or loss or alienation, it would seem the emotions would be greatly diminished, or, at any rate, so unself-conscious as hardly to be reckoned among the joys of existence. So that there is little to fall back upon and cling to outside of the golden and mystic utterance of Christ: " In my Father's house are many mansions. If it were not so "

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—if, indeed, death and despair were the final word upon human life—"I would have told you." And it comes closely linked with the command to overcome the world and its tribulations, to establish the soul's poise upon a definite trust in the unrevealed, eternal issues; for, being of a generation as yet unable to accept and put into practice what we have of earthly truth, we cannot expect heavenly revelations. Doubtless there is much in Herbert Spencer's suggestion that there is probably a "mode of being as much transcending intelligence and will as these transcend mere mechanical motion."

One point made by Mr. Santayana, and one too rarely noted, is the tendency of dogmatic religion to become, by reason perhaps of its very concreteness, a mere détour from, and return to, the path of worldliness. Upon this rock the Roman church shattered, and upon this again the Protestant sects are breaking and becoming mainly philanthropic organizations, infinitely helpful to democracy and to the forging of the links of human brotherhood, but losing more and more the element of devotional worship, and the power of bringing the soul into communion with its Creator. Philosophy and mysticism, being abstract and meditative, seem to hold these clues, and the churches which admit them will have the strongest hold over mankind.

In his treatment of mysticism as a function of the elementary consciousness or as a momentary disintegration of the trained consciousness, Mr. Santayana has fallen short. The mystic sense, like the truly religious sense, is an inner experience and one not to be disproved by the outsider and the uninitiate. Mr. Santayana's *dicta* upon this head have only the value of the vision of a blind man, or of a dissertation upon love by a professor who has been so absorbed in pedagogics that he has never had time or impulse to feel, and has only carefully classified and labelled the phenomena of the great passion.

But, when all is said, Mr. Santayana has given us a valuable contribution to modern analyses of religious motives, not so much because he has built up any very satisfying theory, as because with keen and concise logic, and that austere classicism which marks both his expression and his mode of thought, he has laid bare unworthy and unbalanced theories. His constructive work is entirely confined to showing that, the categories of reason applied to life, and the daily course guided by a high and trained in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

telligence (a gift, alas! not to be had for the asking, though Mr. Santayana seems to overlook this obvious fact), life here and now may, indeed will, be its own reward.

Dr. Saleeby,* though a Spencerian and an evolutionist, and as distant as possible in method from Mr. Santayana, yet arrives at practically the same conclusions. As to the ultimate nature of things man knows nothing and can know nothing; strict scientists do not even yet see their way toward any such generalizations concerning phenomenal mind as they have framed concerning phenomenal matter; but it is open to them to believe, as Dr. Saleeby affirms he *does* believe, that the unknowable reality of which consciousness is the fleeting manifestation is also eternal and changeless, however inexpressible and unthinkable such reality may be. In the end, he sums up, whatever theory serves as a basis for fine action justifies itself.

The scientific spirit of the nineteenth century has led man to climb up the ladder of his own imagination, to seize upon his cloudy dreamland and to dissect it. Having made an eternity of bliss, he has begun to analyze it and to question whether, even if it were possible to prove it, it would be desirable. A form of consciousness unattached to an organism is hard to conceive; a form of consciousness worthy of unbroken and unending continuity is unthinkable, and only by metaphysical shifts can the mind face the idea. Dr. Saleeby can give us no further solace from his evolutionary doctrine than that change is inevitable, and that whatever is fittest to environment will survive. That the survival of the fittest need not necessarily mean survival of the best and highest is obvious. "The conditions may be such that mercy, justice and genius cannot survive under them, while brutality, fraud and convention can." This alone lies in the keeping of man. Maeterlinck to the contrary, we cannot foresee an era when man shall steer his planet at will through the spheres, but in the realm of spiritual destiny and of social environment each will tells, however little. The drift of the tide is indifferent to man's welfare, and only by definite and deliberate effort shall we create an environment in which the noblest hearts shall not be shattered and mutilated.

So that if, on the one hand, prolonged and elaborated speculation seems futile, a myopic indifference to the future, on the

* Saleeby, "Evolution, The Master-key." Harper & Brothers, 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other, means the lowering of standards and the deterioration of environment for future generations. Indeed, it is by means of what seems at times futile reflection that we come at any sense of proportionate values.

So we run up against one of the endless paradoxes of life—that, as the value of the moment depends upon the sense of eternity, so eternity itself seems to be compact of the quality of the fleeting moments.

The real beauty of the scientific standpoint—its refusal to juggle with facts and its demand that the soul, instead of yearning into the dim inane, shall give the highest quality to the moment as it passes—comes out in Professor Münsterberg's* graceful monologue, "The Eternal Life." Extension in time, he points out, is after all no more to be desired than extension in space; and the quality of the soul of a man would be no finer if he stretched up to the moon and across to the ends of the earth. Personality is not *in* time nor *of* it. Itself is creator of both time and space and places objects therein, but itself remains free. To question how long the soul endures, Professor Münsterberg thinks, is like questioning whether the will is round or square, and how many pounds it weighs. Eternity is not duration, but it is the quality of the instant. There is a curious experience known to most men at some period in their lives, when they feel this without being able to give actual account of it—moments when the street before us, for example, with its weighty brick houses, suddenly seems no more than a wavering and indistinct cloudland, utterly lacking in stability and concreteness, or what we call "reality," and when nothing seems actual and lasting but the moral values we have set upon life. In some such sense, it would be quite possible that he who utterly and hopelessly condemns himself should be indeed cast into everlasting darkness, and the quality of that moment of despair be stamped upon its face once and forever.

One point that Professor Münsterberg seems to overlook, in enumerating the reasons men have for desiring immortality, is the longing of most souls to come into completer relations with perfection. They have yearned for God because they have yearned for a fuller being, because they want to know a justice and a charity they themselves could never compass. It is the feeling

* Hugo Münsterberg, "The Eternal Life." Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1905.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that makes Browning insist so strenuously upon the fulfilment of an after-life:

> "On earth the broken arc, in heaven the perfect round;"

the feeling so hauntingly present that, cope with life as we will and to the very best of our powers, it yet remains maimed and fragmentary; and the verdict of the staunchest optimist of the Victorian era is true for most men of developed consciousness:

> "Howsoever came my fate,
> Sorrow did and joy did nowise—life well weighed—preponderate."

The impossibility of conceiving of indefinite duration for so limited a creature as man Professor Münsterberg points out. If he is to live forever, then he must live as something utterly different from his present limited personality.

Just this very fact of the thwarting limitations of this life, of its imperfections and half-development, is the greatest proof of future fulfilment to writers like Mr. Crothers,* who, in his "The Endless Life," again reiterates that the only continuance conceivable to man is spiritual development, wholly divorced from monotonous and endless repetition. To the critically trained mind, historical evidence is too weak to lean upon. The attempts of psychical research to assure us of the lingering about of our dead, their undignified attempts to establish their identity by locating gold-headed canes and repeating trite secrets, are both disheartening and disillusioning. If this were the form of future existence, "dust to dust" and an end of all would be infinitely more consoling. Once again the weight of evidence is simply that, as man becomes more and more alert to the divine issues of the present life, more and more can he afford to throw himself trustfully upon the things which do not yet appear.

As for Dr. Osler's† contribution to the subject, it has only the value of one more testimony that the whole question of immortality lies outside the domain of science, and that the scientific method is likely ever to stand paralyzed by the magnificent assumptions of faith. Dr. Osler's argument that man cares very little about immortality, as evidenced by his own notes taken at

* Samuel McChord Crothers, "The Endless Life." Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1905.

† William Osler, M.D., "Science and Immortality." Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1905.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

five hundred different death-beds, is neither weighty nor illuminating. In a large number of deaths resulting from age, weakness, or prolonged sickness, there is apt to come before the end a noticeable mood of detachment, and with it a great secretiveness or self-sufficiency. A curious and delicate observer may note this mood over and over again—a certain drawing into itself of the soul's interests and an inability and unwillingness to give out its preoccupations. These would probably have been the cases labelled by Dr. Osler "indifferent and unconscious." To say, too, as Dr. Osler does, that men are not interested in immortality, because they do not buttonhole their neighbors and talk about it in the street, is puerile and inadequate. We do not buttonhole our neighbors to talk about the recent death of our only son, or our most exultant and absorbing love-affair, but that is no proof that we do not care. Indeed, it seems to be a part of the law of the ultimate isolation of the soul that its deepest interests are held concealed and protected from other men. Again, Dr. Osler uses these terms: "If we believed in the immortality of the soul, and that the status of souls in all eternity depended on their belief at the moment when they are called to their account;" but these are two utterly separate convictions, in no wise necessarily linked together, and, as a matter of fact, rarely enough so in life. In the end, Dr. Osler admits the twofold nature of man, grants the heart its own claim, and ends with an allusion to the suspended judgment of the greatest of idealists.

Ostwald's "Individuality and Immortality"* attempts to offer no other immortality than the racial instinct, the desire to complete our lives in our children and our children's children, or in our self-sacrificing works for the good of humanity. That such a motive can appeal only to the highly developed consciousness is very evident. We could hardly console Johnnie for his own cut finger by saying: "Don't cry; see, Elizabeth's finger is perfectly sound and well!" and when the creature is going through the slow torture which wins a higher consciousness from him, nothing, absolutely nothing, consoles, but the definite conviction that that fuller and richer consciousness is to be born, and that all works toward one "far-off divine event."

* "Individuality and Immortality," by Wilhelm Ostwald, Professor of Physical Chemistry at the University of Leipzig, Temporary Professor of Harvard College. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1906.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One point of interest in all this speculation, and one that actually rises to the mind as we consider our desire for personal continuation, is the fact that in this life all higher forms of happiness are connected with a distinct sense of the loss of personality. That virtue consists largely in the "heart at leisure from itself," that the most fortunate endowment of genius is the impersonal intellect and a free and wide-roving curiosity, goes without saying. But, also, the rapture and the ecstasy of love are simply the joyous laying aside of one's own life for another's. The bliss of motherhood expresses the same craving of human nature for self-surrender; and, finally, and in its highest form, the experience of all the saints and martyrs, all the soldiers in great causes, all the free lances fighting for an ideal, is an experience of the laying aside of the personal will and yielding to the desire to obey an outer and a self-relieving command.

A work of great speculative interest is Edward Carpenter's "Art of Creation."* His method and his matter do not belong strictly to the scientific field; but his unhesitating assertions of the powers of the self are in a high degree suggestive and exhilarating. It seems fairly true that man is only beginning to realize his power over nature and its agencies, and the developments of the last century point toward the fact that he may do much to extend his creative and controlling powers. "The brain and self-consciousness," says Carpenter, "are mere midwives attending the great birth of the soul. The brain must cease its terrified and insatiate quest, and man must learn to glide below it into the quiet feeling of his own identity with the self of all things." Thus his consciousness deepens to that of universal life, where there are no divided interests, rivalries and recriminations cease, and their place is taken by a profound and intense realization of the unity and common life of all races and creatures. Then the individual is no longer "under the domination of the body and its heredity; but, rising out of the tomb, becomes lord and master of the body's powers and identified with the immortal self of the world." This is the ultimate deliverance from self which brings to birth complete joy in the here and now.

* "The Art of Creation; Essays on the Self and its Powers," by Edward Carpenter. New York, The Macmillan Co.; London, George Allen. 1905.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Only after long experience does the sense of our true identity come to us. And, as the civilized man who has learned what reflection is, can now see his face almost where he will—in pools and rivers and polished surfaces . . . so our true identity once having been learned, our relation to our body having been completed, we shall find the magic of one particular body is no longer necessary, since out of the great ocean of nature we can pick up our own reflection (or make to ourselves a body of some kind) practically anywhere."

Modern speculation seems to emphasize one point quite unanimously, namely: that such immortality as there is to be gained is not come at easily; that, whether in the body or out of the body, many deaths must be died and the self must give up the self more times than one. Indeed, scientists and metaphysicians alike admit that:

"He who flagged not in the earthly strife,
From strength to strength advancing, only he,
His soul well knit and all his battles won,
Mounts, and that hardly, to eternal life."

LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARKETS AND MISERY.

BY UPTON SINCLAIR, AUTHOR OF "THE JUNGLE."

THE disinterested lover of his country who looks round him at the present day finds many things which seem to him disturbing. We are a proverbially optimistic people, and are accustomed to do a good deal of trusting to the Lord in our emergencies; yet there can hardly be an intelligent man to-day who is not conscious of deep disquietude in his soul. We have witnessed the concentration of the industrial powers of the country in the hands of a few men, who have apparently gotten beyond all control of government and law. We have witnessed stroke after stroke of "high finance," which we have perceived to differ little from open robbery, and which we have yet been powerless to prevent. We have witnessed a series of appalling revelations of insurance "graft." We have for years been aware of the corruption which prevails in every department of our Government; and of late we have read the disclosures of Mr. Lincoln Steffens, and his announcement that the corruption is simply another form of economic domination—that this universal bribery is merely another device whereby the "money-power" rules. "A revolution has happened," he tells us, adding that we have no longer "a government of the people, by the people, for the people," but "a government of the people, by the rascals, for the rich." Following closely upon these disclosures, we saw the outbreak of a labor war in Colorado; and we understood that it was directly traceable to the fact that the will of the people of a State, declared at the polls by a vote of two to one, was thwarted by open and flagrant bribery. We saw following upon it deeds of violence upon both sides, ending with the complete overthrow of American institutions in one of the United States, and the setting up of a despotism of "business men." We see the "open shop" move-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment gathering headway, and we know that the result of this must inevitably be the lowering of wages; and at the same time we see the cost of living rising year by year, and so we know that it is inevitable that the popular discontent should grow.

We have grown so used to the failure of all efforts at reform, that we generally take the failure for granted in advance; but still we continue to struggle. Mr. Steffens and Miss Tarbell appeal to the public conscience, and Mr. Lawson and Mr. Russell appeal to the public wrath; Mr. Mitchell organizes the labor-unions, Mr. Post tries to smash them, and Mr. Hearst tries to drive them into politics; Mr. Watson wants the Government to dissolve the trusts, Mr. Bryan wants it to buy them up, Mr. Cleveland wants it to reform the tariff—and so on through a various assortment of remedies.

One who examined these various plans would find, however, one point of agreement among them all. Their authors recognize that before these evils came upon us we had free competition in our industries; and that their coming upon us is coincident with the abolishing of competition and the establishing of various forms of monopoly. Therefore, what we have to do is reestablish free competition, the good old American system of a fair field and no favor, and then all will be well once more. Some of us, who are in business, are more especially interested in accomplishing this with the labor-unions; others of us who are in the unions are more interested in accomplishing it with the trusts; a few of us, sitting aloft upon high episcopal, editorial, and academic thrones, are disinterestedly interested in achieving it with both. But because we perceive that it is a matter of life and death, and because failure is unthinkable, we dare not admit that we are failing, and we resolutely shut our eyes to the fact of our failure and go on blindly repeating our ancient formula. To acknowledge that industrial competition is dead, and will stay dead, would be to acknowledge that the evils of the time were without a remedy; and the people would not stand that.

I am acquainted with only one man among all our orthodox advisers who does not let the people stand between him and the truth, who has not only the eyes to see the facts, but the courage to speak them out—Mr. Brooks Adams. "Masses accumulate in the United States," explains Mr. Adams, in his "New Empire," "because administration by masses is cheaper than administration

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by detail. Masses take the form of corporations, and the men who rise to the control of these corporations rise because they are fittest. The process is natural selection. The life of the community lies in these masses. Derange them, and there would immediately follow an equivalent loss of energy." This is no trifling matter either, as Mr. Adams goes on to explain; for we are battling for our very lives with other nations, and the slightest mistake may cost us the victory, may "propel the seat of empire" to some other land. Our greatest danger, in Mr. Adams's view, is just our sentimental regard for the "people" and what the people wish—a regard which leads us to shrink from the truth about our industrial necessities. "The alternative is plain," he declares. "We may cherish ideals and risk substantial benefits to realize them," and that means national ruin. What we have to do is to "regard our Government dispassionately, as we should any other matter of business." Instead of viewing with horror the prospect of our political institutions being overthrown by the trusts, we should face this result, recognizing it as both inevitable and desirable. Our masses of capital "are there because the conditions of our civilization are such as to make it cheaper that they should be there; and if our political institutions are ill-adapted to their propagation and development, then political institutions must be readjusted." We may be unwilling to learn this lesson, but it will be taught us all the same. "With conservative populations, *slaughter* is nature's remedy," says Mr. Adams. "History teems with examples of civilizations which have been destroyed through an unreasoning inertia. . . . The fall of the empire of Haroun-al-Rashid exemplifies an universal law." Mr. Adams goes on to set forth that "the greatest prize of modern times is Northern China"; and because, since his book was written, we have lost the chance which we had to seize it, in his judgment we must be already on the way to our ruin.

There is a certain relentlessness about Mr. Adams which fills the reader with rebellion, and makes him think. The average imperialist carefully avoids doing this; he veils his doctrines with moral phrases, with the decent pretence of "destiny" at the very least. But Mr. Adams dances a very war-dance upon the thing called "moral sense"—never before was it made to seem such an impertinent superfluity. Whatever may have been the case with others, it had happened to the writer of this paper to read

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roosevelt and Kipling and the Kaiser and all of the other prophets of Imperialism, and to have only vague suspicions and discomforts; it was not until he came upon "The New Empire" that he was forced at last to fight his way out of the nightmare jungle of the devil's gospel of *Competition*.

Have you, the reader, never had one smallest doubt? Does it not, for instance, seem strange to you now, when you think of it, that this mighty people cannot stay quietly at home, and live their own life and mind their own affairs? How does it happen that our existence as a nation depends upon expansion? Is it that our population is growing so fast? But here is our Imperialist President lamenting that our population is not growing fast enough! And so we have to fight to find room for our children; and we have to have more children, in order that we may be able to fight! We deplore race-suicide, and we give as our reason that it prevents race-murder!

Picture to yourself half a dozen men on an island. If the island be fertile, they can get along without any foreign trade, can they not? And then why cannot a *nation* do it? According to Mulhall, in 1894 two millions of our agricultural laborers were raising food for foreign countries. And all our imports are luxuries, save a few things such as tea and coffee and some medicines! And still our existence as a nation depends upon foreign trade—trade with Filipinos and Chinamen, with Hottentots and Esquimaux! Why?

Can you, the reader, tell me? We manufacture more than we can use, you say. Unless we can sell the balance to the Chinamen, some of our factories must close down, and then some of our people would starve. But why, I ask, cannot our own starving people have the things that go abroad—some of all that food that goes abroad, for instance? Why is it that the Chinamen come first, and our own people afterwards? Until we have made some things for the Chinamen, you explain, we have no money to buy anything ourselves. And so always the Chinamen first! It seems such a strange, upside-down arrangement—does it not seem so to you? For, look you, the people of England are in the same fix, and the people of Germany are in the same fix—the people of all the competing nations are in the same fix! They actually have to go to war to kill each other, in order to get a chance to sell something to the Chinamen, so that they can get

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

money to buy some things for themselves! They were actually doing that in Manchuria for eighteen months! More amazing yet, they had to go and murder some of the Chinamen, in order to compel the rest to buy something, so that they could get money to buy something for themselves!

How long can it be possible for a human being, with a spark of either conscience or brains in him, to gaze at such a state of affairs and not *know* that there is something wrong about it? And how long could he gaze before the truth of it would flash over him—that the reason for it is that some private party owns all the machinery and materials of production, and will not give the people anything, until they have first made something that can be sold! That all the world lies at the mercy of those who own the materials and machinery, and who leave men to starve when they cannot make profits! And that this is why we Americans cannot stay at home and be happy, but are forced to go trading with Filipinos and Chinamen, Hottentots and Esquimaux, and competing for "empire" with our brothers in England and Germany and Japan!

If the reader be an average American, these thoughts will be new to him. He has been brought up on a diet of diluted Malthusianism. He understands that life has always been a struggle for existence and always will be; that there is not food enough to go round, and that therefore, every now and then, the surplus population has to be cut down by famine and war. I said "diluted" Malthusianism, because, while he swears allegiance to the doctrine, he doesn't like to think about it, and when it comes to the practical test he shows that he does not really believe it. Whenever famine comes, he subscribes to a grain-fund, and does his best to defeat nature; when war comes, he gets up a Red Cross Society for the same purpose. And yet he still continues to swear by this wiping out of the nations, and any discussion about abolishing poverty he waves aside as Utopian.

The writer may fail in his purpose with this paper, but he will not have written in vain if he can lead a few men to see the pitiful folly of that half-baked theory which ranks men with the wild beasts of the jungle, and ignores the existence of both science and morality. He can do that, assuredly, with any one whom he can induce to read one little book—Prince Kropotkin's "Fields, Factories and Workshops."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The book was published eight years ago, but apparently it has not yet had time to affect the cogitations of the orthodox economists. You still read, as you have been used to reading since the days of Adam Smith, that the possibilities of the soil are strictly limited, and that population always stays just within the starvation limit. Nearly all the fertile land in this country, for instance, is now in use, and so we shall soon reach the limit here. The forty million people of Great Britain have long since passed it, and they would starve to death were it not for our surplus. And there are portions of the world where population is even more dense, as in Belgium. All this you have known from your school-days, and you think you know it perfectly, and beyond dispute; and so how astonished you will be to be told that it is simply one of the most stupid and stupefying delusions that ever were believed and propagated among men: that the limits of the productive possibilities of the soil have not only not been attained, but are, so far as science can now see, absolutely unattainable; that not only could England support with ease her own population on her own soil, and not only could Belgium do it, but any most crowded portion of the world could do it, and do it once again, and yet once again, and do it with two or three hours of work a day by a small portion of its population! That England could now support, not merely her thirty-three million inhabitants, but seventy-five and perhaps a hundred million! And that the United States could now support a billion and a quarter of people, or just about the entire population of this planet! And that this could be done year after year, and entirely without any possibility of the exhaustion of the soil! And all this not any theory of a closet speculator or a Utopian dreamer, but by methods that are used year after year by thousands and tens of thousands of men who are making fortunes by it in all portions of the world—in the market-gardens of Paris and London, of Belgium, Holland and the island of Jersey, the truck-farms of Florida and Minnesota, and of Norfolk, Virginia!

Prince Kropotkin writes:

"While science devotes its chief attention to industrial pursuits, a limited number of lovers of nature and a legion of workers, whose very names will remain unknown to posterity, have created of late a quite new agriculture, as superior to modern farming as modern farming is superior to the old three-fields system of our ancestors. They smile

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when we boast about the rotation system, having permitted us to take from the field one crop every year, or four crops every three years, because their ambition is to have six and nine crops from the very same plot of land every twelve months. They do not understand our talk about good and bad soils, because they make the soil themselves, and make it in such quantities as to be compelled yearly to sell some of it; otherwise, it would raise up the levels of their gardens by half an inch every year. They aim at cropping, not five or six tons of grass to the acre, as we do, but from fifty to one hundred tons of various vegetables on the same space; not twenty-five dollars' worth of hay, but five hundred dollars' worth of vegetables, of the plainest description, cabbages and carrots. That is where agriculture is going now."

The writer tells about all these things in detail. Here is the *culture maraîchere* of Paris—a M. Ponce, with a tiny orchard of two and seven-tenths acres, for which he pays $500 rent a year, and from which he takes produce that could not be named short of several pages of figures: 20,000 pounds of carrots, 20,000 of onions and radishes, 6,000 heads of cabbage, 3,000 of cauliflower, 5,000 baskets of tomatoes, 5,000 dozen choice fruit, 154,000 heads of "salad"—in all, 250,000 pounds of vegetables. Says the author:

"The Paris gardener not only defies the soil—he would grow the same crops on an asphalt pavement—he defies climate. His walls, which are built to reflect light and to protect the wall-trees from the northern winds, his wall-tree shades and glass protectors, his *pépinières*, have made a rich Southern garden out of the suburbs of Paris."

The consequence of this is that the population of the districts of that city, three millions and a half of people, could, if it were necessary, be maintained in their own territory, provided with food both animal and vegetable, from a piece of ground less than sixty miles on a side! And at the same time, by the same methods, they are raising 30 tons of potatoes on an acre in Minnesota, and 350 bushels of corn in Iowa, and 600 bushels of onions in Florida. And with machinery, on the prairie wheat-farms, they raise crops at a cost which makes twelve hours and a half of work *of all kinds* enough to supply a man with the flour part of his food for a year! And while all this has been going on for a decade, while encyclopedias have been written about it, our political economists continue to discuss wages and labor, rent and interest, exchange and consumption, from the standpoint of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dreary, century-old formula that there must always be an insufficient supply of food in the world!

Such is the state of affairs with agriculture; and now how is it with everything else? In the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor (1898), Carroll D. Wright has figured the relative costs of doing various pieces of work by hand and by modern machinery. Here are a few of the cases he gives:

"*Making of 10 plows:* By hand, 2 workmen, performing 11 distinct operations, working a total of 1,180 hours, and paid $54.46. By machine, 52 workmen, 97 operations, 37½ hours, $7.90.

"*Making of 500 lbs. of butter:* By hand, 3 men, 7 operations, 125 hours, $10.66. By machine, 7 men, 8 operations, 12½ hours, $1.78.

"*Making 500 yds. twilled cottonade:* By hand, 3 men, 19 operations, 7,534 hours, $135.61. By machine, 252 men, 43 operations, 84 hours, $6.81.

"*Making of 100 pairs of cheap boots:* By hand, 2 workmen, 83 operations, 1,436 hours, $408.50. By machine, 113 workmen, 122 operations, 154 hours, $35.40."

Thus we see human labor has been cut to the extent of from 80 to 95 per cent. From other sources I have gathered a few facts about the latest machinery. In Pennsylvania, some sheep were shorn and the wool turned into clothing in 6 hours, 4 minutes. A steer was killed, its hide tanned, turned into leather and made into shoes in 24 hours. The ten million bottles used by the Standard Oil Company every year are now blown by machinery. An electric riveting-machine puts rivets in steel-frame buildings at the rate of two per minute. Two hundred and sixty needles per minute, ten million match-sticks per day, five hundred garments cut per day—each by a machine tended by one little boy. The newest weaving-looms run through the dinner-hour and an hour and a half after the factory closes, making cloth with no one to tend them at all. The new basket-machine invented by Mergenthaler, the inventor of the linotype, is now in operation everywhere, "making fruit-baskets, berry-baskets and grape-baskets of a strength and quality never approached by hand labor. Fancy a single machine that will turn out completed berry-baskets at the rate of 12,000 per day of nine hours' work! This is at the rate of 1,300 per hour, or over twenty baskets a minute! One girl, operating this machine, does the work of twelve skilled hand operators!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Since all these wonders are the commonplace facts of modern industry, it is not surprising that here and there men should begin to think about them; here is the naïve question recently asked by the editor of a Montreal newspaper which I happened on:

"With the best of machinery at the present day, one man can produce woollens for 300 people. One man can produce boots and shoes for 1,000 people. One man can produce bread for 200 people. Yet thousands cannot get woollens, boots and shoes, or bread. *There must be some reason for this state of affairs!*"

There is a reason, a perfectly plain and simple reason, which all over the world the working-people, whom it concerns, are coming to understand. The reason is that all the woollen manufactories, the boot and shoe and bread manufactories, and all the sources of the raw materials of these, and all the means of handling and distributing them when they are manufactured, belong to a few private individuals instead of to the community as a whole. And so, instead of the cotton-spinner, the shoe-operative and the bread-maker having free access to them, to work each as long as he pleases, produce as much as he cares to, and exchange his products for as much of the products of other workers as he needs, each one of these workers can only get at the machines by the consent of another man, and then does not get what he produces, but only a small fraction of it, and does not get that except when the owner of the balance can find some one with money enough to buy that balance at a profit to him!

Prof. Hertzka, the Austrian economist, in his "Laws of Social Evolution," has elaborately investigated the one real question of political economy to-day, the actual labor and time necessary for the creation, under modern conditions, of the necessaries of life for a people. Here are the results for the Austrian people, of 22,000,000:

"It takes 26,250,000 acres of agricultural land, and 7,500,000 of pasturage, for all agricultural products. Then I allowed a house to be built for every family, consisting of five rooms. I found that all industries, agriculture, architecture, building, flour, sugar, coal, iron, machine-building, clothing, and chemical production, need 615,000 laborers employed 11 hours per day, 300 days a year, to satisfy every imaginable want for 22,000,000 inhabitants.

"These 615,000 laborers are only 12.3 per cent. of the population able to do work, excluding women and all persons under 16 or over 50 years of age: all these latter to be considered as not able,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Should the 5,000,000 able men be engaged in work, instead of 615,000, they need only to work 36.9 days every year to produce everything needed for the support of the population of Austria. But should the 5,000,000 work all the year, say 300 days—which they would probably have to do to keep the supply fresh in every department—each one would only work 1 hour and 22½ minutes per day.

"But to engage to produce all the *luxuries*, in addition, would take, in round figures, 1,000,000 workers, classed and assorted as above, or only 20 per cent. of all those able, excluding every woman, or every person under 16 or over 50, as before. The 5,000,000 able, strong male members could produce everything imaginable for the whole nation of 22,000,000 in 2 hours and 12 minutes per day, working 300 days a year."

But then you say: If this be true, if two hours' work will produce everything, how can everybody go on working twelve hours forever? They can't; and that is just why I am writing this paper. They can do it only until they have filled the needs, first of themselves, then of all the Filipinos and Chinamen, Hottentots and Esquimaux, who have money to buy anything—and then until they have filled all the factories, warehouses and stores of the country to overflowing. Then they cannot do one single thing more; then they are out of work. They can go on so long as their masters can find a market in which to sell their product at a profit; then they have to stop. And then suddenly (*instantly*, God help them!) they have to take their choice between two alternatives—between an industrial democracy, and a political empire. Either they will hear Prince Kropotkin, or they will hear Mr. Brooks Adams. Either they will take the instruments and means of production and produce for use and not for profit; or else they will forge themselves into an engine of war to be wielded by a military despot. In that case, they will fling themselves upon China and Japan, and seize Northern China, "the greatest prize of modern times." They will enter upon a career of empire, and by the wholesale slaughter of war they will keep down population, while at the same time by the wholesale destruction of war they keep down the surplus of products. So there will be more work for the workers for a time, and more profits for the masters for a time; until what wealth there is in Northern China has also been concentrated and possessed, when once more there will begin distress. By that time, however, we shall have an hereditary aristocracy strongly intrenched, and a proletariat degraded beyond recall; so that our riots will end in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mere slaughter and waste, and we shall never again see freedom. We shall run then the whole course of the Roman Empire—of frenzied profligacy among the wealthy, and beastly ferocity among the populace: until at last we fall into imbecility, and are overwhelmed by some new, clean race which the strong heart of nature has poured out.

Before many years, now, this question must become the question of the hour. The cotton-factories of Massachusetts and Canada are shut down half the time, and those who work in them are told that there is too much cotton—that they and their children must go in rags because they have spun so much cloth. And, of course, some of the railroad hands who moved the cotton are also out, and the miners who furnished the coal for the factories; two years ago a similar trouble in other industries had turned some two or three million wage-earners into the streets to starve, when the Russo-Japanese war gave a brief respite to our capitalists. In England this condition of unemployment has been chronic for a decade, and the reader who has a strong stomach may get Mr. Jack London's "People of the Abyss," and read what are the consequences of such a state of affairs. Here is a paragraph chosen at random—a scene in a London Park:

"We went up the narrow gravelled walk. On the benches on either side was arrayed a mass of miserable and diseased humanity, the sight of which would have impelled Doré to more diabolical flights of fancy than he ever succeeded in achieving. It was a welter of filth and rags, of all manner of loathsome skin-diseases, open sores, bruises, grossness, indecency, leering monstrosities and bestial faces. A chill, raw wind was blowing, and these creatures huddled there in their rags, sleeping for the most part, or trying to sleep. Here were a dozen women, ranging in age from twenty years to seventy. Next a babe, possibly nine months old, lying asleep, flat on the hard bench, with neither pillow nor covering, nor with any one looking after it. Next, half a dozen men sleeping bolt-upright, and leaning against one another in their sleep. In one place a family group, a child asleep in its sleeping mother's arms, and the husband (or male mate) clumsily mending a dilapidated shoe. On another bench, a woman trimming the frayed strips of her rags with a knife, and another woman with thread and needle, sewing up rents. Adjoining, a man holding a sleeping woman in his arms. Farther on, a man, his clothing caked with gutter-mud, asleep with his head in the lap of a woman, not more than 25 years old, and also asleep.

"'Those women there,' said our guide, 'will sell themselves for thru'pence, or tu'pence, or a loaf of stale bread.' He said it with a cheerful sneer."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And then turn back to the preface:

"It must not be forgotten that the time of which I write was considered 'good times' in England. The starvation and lack of shelter I encountered constitute a chronic condition of misery which is never wiped out, even in the periods of greatest prosperity. Following the summer in question came a hard winter. To such an extent did the suffering and positive starvation increase that society was unable to cope with it. Great numbers of the unemployed formed into processions, as many as a dozen at a time, and daily marched through the streets of London crying for bread. Mr. Justin McCarthy, writing in the month of January, 1903, to the New York 'Independent,' briefly epitomizes the situation as follows: 'The workhouses have no space left in which to pack the starving crowds who are craving every night at their doors for food and shelter. All the charitable institutions have exhausted their means in trying to raise supplies of food for the famishing residents of the garrets and cellars of London lanes and alleys.'"

And all over the world it is just the same; the race for markets is becoming fiercer and fiercer, and the markets are growing scarcer and scarcer. The greatest prize of modern times has been seized; and so the Fall River operatives who supplied the Manchus with cotton shirts are out of work; and the cotton-mills of Georgia and Alabama are filling up with children six or eight years old who work for nine cents a day; and even these will soon be displaced, because in the cotton-mills of India the wretched victims of the dying monster of Competition can be made to work both day and night, eating and sleeping by their machines, and perishing within two or three years.

The only question, of course, is as to how long it can go on. All over the world, the workers of society are finding out about it, and are teaching their companions about it; and so we see, looming like a mighty storm-cloud, in every civilized nation, the Socialist movement. Ridicule and obloquy, blandishments and menaces, persecution, exile and imprisonment, have all proved powerless to stop it; devoted and heroic men and women give their labor and their lives to teaching it—writing, speaking, exhorting, toiling day and night to open the eyes of the masses to the truth. And in every nation the movement goes ahead and forms a political party; and, when that is done, it begins to cast a vote, and every year that vote is larger than it was the year before. In Germany, it was 30,000 in 1867, 487,000 in 1877, 763,000 in 1887, 1,787,000 in 1893, 2,125,000 in 1898 and 3,008,-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

000 in 1903. In Austria, it was 90,000 in 1895 and nearly a million in 1900. In Belgium, it was 334,000 in 1894 and 534,000 in 1898. In Switzerland, it was 14,000 in 1890 and 100,000 in 1901. In France, it has members in the cabinet, and in Italy and Australia it holds the balance of power and turns out ministries. In Japan, it has started its first newspaper, and in Argentina it has elected its first deputy. In the United States, it now has 2,200 locals and 30,000 subscribing members. It has several monthly magazines and about thirty-five daily and weekly papers, one of which ("The Appeal to Reason," of Girard, Kansas), has a circulation of a quarter of a million, and at date of writing is preparing the largest edition ever printed by any paper in the world—the so-called "Trust Edition," of over three million copies. In 1888, the Socialist vote in America was 2,000; in 1892, it was 21,000; in 1898, it was 91,000; in 1900, it was 131,000; in 1902, it was 285,000 and in 1904 it was 436,000. In 1906 it will be between 700,000 and 800,000, unless the writer is very much mistaken; unless he is still more mistaken, Socialism will, from that time, be the only living political issue in America. His study of the economic situation underlying this political phenomenon has led him to believe that the industrial revolution that is coming must take place in America within the next ten years; and his object in writing this paper is to urge upon patriotic and intelligent Americans, of all classes, that it is time for them to open their eyes to the facts. The question to be considered—the only question—is whether they wish that coming revolution to be one of ballots or of bullets; mainly, he believes, this now depends upon what proportion of the ruling class, the present industrial aristocracy, can be made to take an intelligent view of Socialism, and to perceive that its final triumph is as inevitable as the breaking out of a chicken from its egg.

UPTON SINCLAIR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUSAN B. ANTHONY: THE WOMAN AND HER WORK.

BY IDA HUSTED HARPER.

THE world in its progress reached a period about the middle of the last century when it needed just such a reformer as Susan B. Anthony. The time had come for the regeneration of that half of humanity neglected in the struggle for existence through which the race had evolved from savagery to civilization. In this struggle, woman, handicapped by motherhood, domestic requirements and physical limitations, had not been able to keep pace with man, and, as the natural result, had become wholly subject to his laws, customs and commands. When the claims of material necessities began to grow less strenuous, there came an opportunity for the more spiritual forces to gain recognition, and thus dawned the era of a free womanhood.

A few prophets among women had been crying in the wilderness for a number of years when Elizabeth Cady Stanton sounded her trumpet-call for a gathering of the believers in 1848. Its echoes reached to the East and the West, and slumbering forces were roused to action. The spirit of unrest continued to spread; women began to wonder and ask questions; the time was ripe for a revolution, and the one to direct it was at hand, for, just as the century turned into its second half, came Susan B. Anthony. No one who makes a careful study of the great movement for the emancipation of women can fail to recognize in Miss Anthony its supreme leader. Her powers of speaking and writing were surpassed, perhaps, by the splendid abilities of Mrs. Stanton; but, as a planner, an organizer, a manager, a politician in the best sense of the word, Miss Anthony was unequalled. The qualities of these are even more essential in the campaign

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work necessary to a cause which enters the domain of politics than are those of the orator or the writer. But there were other traits possessed by Miss Anthony which made her leadership pre-eminent. She had a keen discernment of special gifts in other women which could be utilized and a faculty for bringing and keeping them in the work. Almost beyond any other, she had the power to create a following which would remain unwaveringly loyal and devoted in the face of repeated disappointments and defeats. She was endowed, as few others have been, with an unflinching courage, determination and spirit of personal sacrifice, which were needed more in her especial work than in any other ever undertaken by woman. But the strongest reason why Susan B. Anthony will be ever acknowledged the general-in-chief of this long contest for the freedom of woman is that she is the only one who gave to it her whole life, consecrating to its service every hour of her time and every power of her being. Other women did what they could; came into the work for a while and dropped out; had the divided interests of family and the social relations; turned their attention to reforms which promised speedier rewards; surrendered to the forces of persecution which assailed them. With Miss Anthony, the cause of woman took the place of husband, children, society; it was her work and her recreation; her politics and her religion. "I know only woman and her disfranchised," was her creed.

In a comprehensive article entitled "Woman's Half-Century of Evolution,"* written soon after the death of Mrs. Stanton, Miss Anthony set forth in detail the conditions existing at the time they began their work together, and the gradual steps in progress to the close of the century. She gave the Declaration of Independence and the resolutions adopted at that first Woman's Rights convention in 1848, and showed that all the demands then made, so radical that they were denounced and ridiculed from one end of the country to the other, have now been granted practically in full, except the one for the suffrage; and that this has been recognized to such an extent as to place its ultimate success beyond question. The object of the present article is to study the character of Miss Anthony herself and her part in the revolution which has taken place in the status of woman.

Miss Anthony came from English stock and many generations

* North American Review, December, 1902.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of New England ancestors, the first of them settling in Rhode Island in 1634. Her grandparents and parents were born in Massachusetts, those on the paternal side belonging to the Society of Friends from the time it came into existence. The maternal grandparents were Baptists, but the grandfather, Daniel Read, became a convert to the Universalist faith. His wife, it is said, "wore the skin off her knees" praying that God would make him see the error of his ways, but he never did, and to the end of his life he found his chief enjoyment in setting forth the merits of free salvation. He served with honor through the entire Revolutionary War, was in the expedition against Quebec, at the capture of Ticonderoga, the battle of Bennington and the fatal fight at Stone Arabia. After the war he became a member of the Massachusetts Legislature. Both grandfathers had excellent farms and comfortable homes near Adams, Massachusetts, acquired a competency, educated their children and represented the best type of the sturdy New-Englanders of early times.

At Adams, in the Berkshire Hills, overlooked by "Old Greylock," that glorified mountain peak, was born Susan B. Anthony, the second of eight children, February 15th, 1820. Her father was a prosperous cotton-manufacturer, and in 1826 he removed to Battenville, Washington County, New York, to form a partnership with Judge John McLean and conduct his business on a larger scale. He was a liberal and public-spirited man, progressive far beyond his times. He belonged to the so-called "Hicksite" Friends, but, although their religious beliefs were broad enough to suit him, he was several times "disciplined" for disregarding their strict usages; first, for marrying outside the faith; then for wearing an overcoat with a cape and a colored handkerchief around his neck; and, finally, he was "disowned" because he allowed the young people to dance in his house. He felt this very keenly but would not give up his own ideas of right and wrong, and continued to attend the Friends' meetings. He loved this form of religion, as did his wife and daughter, and Miss Anthony always attributed very largely to its influence her strong belief in the equality of the sexes, her hatred of slavery in any form, her tendency toward public speaking and the final adoption of her career. Her father believed in the education of women and their economic independence; and in giving her the one he prepared her for the other.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1837-8, the commercial panic practically destroyed the cotton-manufactures, and in 1845 the Anthony family removed to Rochester, New York, which was henceforth their home. Although Miss Anthony was born in Massachusetts, she lived in New York from the time she was six years old, and she identified herself fully with the interests of that State, loved it, was proud of it, shed lustre upon it; and yet never was she permitted the smallest part in its laws or its government.

Miss Anthony was a successful teacher until she was in her thirtieth year; but in the summer of 1849, she returned home with an intense desire for a wider field of work. To most women the prospect would have been hopeless, for there was literally no vocation except teaching for an educated woman. But she was a Quaker, her aunt had been a noted "preacher," something in her soul was striving for expression, and she had been taught that a woman's right to speak was exactly the same as a man's. As temperance work was then the only outlet for women's activities in public life, she took it up with great zeal. Outraged by the way men treated women in the conventions, she enlisted Mrs. Stanton's cooperation, and they formed a State Women's Temperance Society in which men had no part. It held several successful conventions, but by 1852 Miss Anthony had become thoroughly convinced that the conditions of women must be radically changed before they could do effective work in great reforms, and that their paramount duty was to secure their own rights, legal, educational, civil, industrial and political. She attended for the first time, in September of that year, a Woman's Rights Convention, met the able women connected with it, heard their arguments for the franchise, and came away fully satisfied that the underlying right, the one which would secure to women every other, was the right of suffrage. Her Biography says:

> "A sense of the terrible helplessness of being utterly without representation came upon her with crushing force. The first, great cause of the injustice which pressed upon women from every point was clearly revealed to her, and she understood, as never before, that any class which is compelled to be legislated for by another class must always be at a disadvantage."

In this opinion Miss Anthony never wavered. By 1854 all other work was laid aside, and from that time to the end of her long life she devoted herself, body, mind and soul, to the one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

task of securing the rights of women. Well might the little band of reformers stand appalled at the situation which confronted them. The masses of women were almost wholly uneducated. Not only were the colleges closed against them, but not even a high school was open. Outside of teaching (for a beggarly pittance) they could earn a living only at menial occupations. The first fight to be made was to secure for them the right to speak in public, to ask for the redress of their own wrongs. Everywhere the English common law prevailed, which had been adopted by the colonies and never changed. The wife had no legal existence, or, as Blackstone expressed it, "the very being, or existence, of the woman is suspended during marriage." She could not own property, buy or sell, sue or be sued, make a contract, testify in court or control her own wages. The father could apprentice young children without the mother's consent and dispose of them by will at his death. There was but one cause for divorce, and the husband, though the guilty party, could retain the property and the children.

Miss Anthony and her associates clearly saw that, if women had power to elect lawmakers, these laws could be speedily swept from the books; but, since the right of the franchise is the one it has been impossible to obtain, half a century has been required to replace them with juster statutes, and the work is yet far from finished, as a part or all of these laws are still in force in various States. But that conditions have immeasurably improved is everywhere evident. Women have as good and as many opportunities for education as men have. Their right to speak in public is gladly recognized, and through their great organizations they wield a vast influence. All avenues of employment, except political, are open to them, not always on equal terms with men, but for millions of them economic independence is assured. In many States the laws are nearly fair, and in all but two or three they have been much improved. Miss Anthony lived to see all this as, in a measure, the direct result of her own labors. There are many reasons why the franchise has not been gained, but two of them are amply sufficient: (1) The right of suffrage is the only one intrenched in the Constitution and requires the consent of a majority of all the men in a State to grant it; (2) Men understand that the ballot is the source of their power, and they are determined not to share it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It would be impossible in this brief space to go into the details of Miss Anthony's more than fifty years of hard, continuous work, they fill two volumes of a thousand pages. A few events, however, stand out with such striking prominence as to call for especial attention. Miss Anthony was instrumental in creating not only the first State, but also the first National, organization of women—the National Woman Suffrage Association, formed in New York in 1869. It has been for thirty-seven years the vital force in the movement for securing the franchise, and through its State auxiliaries in obtaining many improvements in conditions for women and children. Miss Anthony was ever its mainstay, never missed but two annual conventions, always held official position and was president after Mrs. Stanton's retirement in 1892 until her own eightieth birthday in 1900, when she became honorary president. The Association supports the States in their suffrage campaigns, furnishes money and workers, keeps organizers constantly in the field, maintains a press bureau, from its headquarters sends out tons of literature every year, and, with its board of able women, gives great power and stability to the movement. Miss Anthony loved it as her child, guided its footsteps, watched its growth, rejoiced in its achievements, and made the last journey of her life to attend its convention at Baltimore in February.

Miss Anthony's one deviation from her work for woman suffrage was her effort to render every possible assistance in the struggle for the abolition of slavery. Her home was a meeting-place for the "Garrisonians," and, if not a station on the "underground railroad," certainly in close touch with some that were. Here she met in intimate acquaintance Garrison himself, Phillips, Pillsbury, Douglass, the Fosters and others who were stirring the conscience of the country by their fiery eloquence, and they found in her an ardent sympathizer. Recognizing her unusual ability, the American Anti-Slavery Society engaged her in 1856 as organizer, speaker and manager, and from then until the breaking out of the Civil War she divided her time between the work of freeing the slaves and that of securing freedom for women. In 1863, at the urgent request of many prominent men, she went to New York and, with the cooperation of Mrs. Stanton and many other patriotic women, organized the Women's National Loyal League. For fifteen months they labored without

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ceasing to secure petitions for the abolishment of slavery by Congressional action. Miss Anthony superintended this great work, took the entire financial responsibility and secured the necessary funds. The 400,000 names obtained by women, Charles Sumner and Henry Wilson many times declared, were the bulwark of the authority by which Congress submitted the Thirteenth Amendment that forever abolished slavery.

The Amendment was declared ratified in December, 1865, but, even before this glorious result of their work was accomplished, the women learned to their amazement and indignation that Congress was about to submit another amendment for the purpose of enfranchising these newly freed negro men which was to be carefully worded for the express purpose of excluding all women! Miss Anthony, ever on the watch-tower, was the first to sound the alarm. She hastened to Mrs. Stanton in New York, and the two instantly set to work to arouse the friends of woman suffrage to this new and most formidable danger. The National Constitution was silent on the question of the franchise, and the women therefore had only to reckon with the State constitutions, but it was now proposed to add a suffrage amendment to the former document which should include the word "male," and thus deliberately put up against women the insurmountable barrier of the Federal Constitution! Miss Anthony and Mrs. Stanton called public meetings, they made speeches, they circulated petitions, they wrote hundreds of letters protesting against this outrage, but to their intense surprise and anguish they were met with coldness and opposition. Garrison, Phillips, Curtis, Tilton, Higginson, Douglass, Gerrit Smith, Thaddeus Stevens—all the eminent men who had aided them so faithfully in the past—turned against them now. Even the women, with but few exceptions, yielded to the frantic appeals that they would not imperil the chance of the negro men by intruding their own claims. That the enfranchisement of these would intrench the Republican party in a position of apparently permanent power was carefully kept in the background. "Would you have us lose all we have gained by the war?" was the argument used to the women. "This is the negro's hour. When he is secured in his rights, then your turn will come."

Miss Anthony and Mrs. Stanton never yielded one inch of their position. They had no faith in the promises; they knew that this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amendment would add another million to the millions who already had political sovereignty over women, and that their enemies henceforth would have only to barricade themselves behind the National Constitution. They were willing negro men should be enfranchised, but not at the expense of all women. Deserted and denounced by their former friends and fellow workers, they never ceased their protests against this terrible injustice until the Fourteenth Amendment was finally declared adopted in 1868; and they lived to see their predictions verified to the letter.

Up to this time, those who were working for woman suffrage had considered no plan except to obtain it through a change of constitution in each State. They now had learned that the National Constitution itself could be so amended as to enfranchise an entire class of citizens, and henceforth that part of them who had followed the standard of Miss Anthony and Mrs. Stanton, and who soon returned to it, directed their efforts wholly to obtaining the suffrage by this method. "The Revolution," that fearless, radical and independent paper, established in New York in 1868, with Mrs. Stanton as editor and Miss Anthony as business manager, advocated this procedure with great earnestness. The National Association, formed in 1869, as noted above, adopted this plan of action exclusively, held all its conventions in Washington, and had its ablest speakers appear before Congressional Committees to urge the submission of an amendment to enfranchise women. The Fifteenth Amendment, which almost immediately followed the Fourteenth, confirmed the opinion that this was the most practicable way. Miss Anthony herself was unalterably convinced of it, and she addressed Committees of every Congress from 1869 to 1906, with logical argument and impassioned pleading that they would do as much for all women as they had done for negro men. Limited space prevents the reproduction in full of any of these matchless addresses, but a quotation from one, made in March, 1884, will illustrate their power and pathos:

"This is the fifteenth year we have appeared before Congress in person, and the nineteenth by petitions, asking national protection for women in the exercise of their right to vote. In the winter of 1865 and 1866 we sent your honorable body a ten-thousand prayer, asking you not to put 'male' in the second section of the proposed Fourteenth Amendment; and again we appealed to you by thousands of petitions that you would add 'sex' after 'race or color' in the Fifteenth, but all to no avail. Then by an eighty-thousand petition in 1871 we demanded the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enactment of a declaratory law that women had the right to vote under the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment. This, too, was denied us, not only by Congress, but by the Supreme Court, which held that the framers of the amendment had only 'colored men' in their thought, therefore none others could come within its purview. From 1876 to the present we have from year to year poured into Congress hundreds of thousands of petitions asking you to take the initiative step for another amendment which shall specifically prohibit the disfranchisement of women.

"But, you say, why do you not go to your several States to secure this right? I answer, because we have neither the women nor the money to make the canvasses of the thirty-eight States, school-district by school-district, to educate each individual man out of the old belief that woman was created to be his subject. Four State legislatures submitted the question of striking 'male' from their constitutions—Kansas, Michigan, Colorado and Nebraska—and we made the best canvass of each which was possible for a disfranchised class outside of all political help. Negro suffrage was again and again overwhelmingly voted down in various States; and you know, gentlemen, that if the negro had never had the ballot until the majority of white men, particularly the foreign born, had voted 'yes,' he would have gone without it until the crack of doom. It was because of this prejudice of the unthinking majority that Congress submitted the question of the negro's enfranchisement to the legislatures of the several States, to be adjudicated by the educated, broadened representatives of the people. We now appeal to you to lift the decision of *our* question from the vote of the populace to that of the legislatures, that thereby you may be as considerate and just to the women of this nation as you were to the freedmen.

"Every new privilege granted to woman has been by the legislatures. The liberal laws for married women, the right of the wife to own and control her inherited property and separate earnings, the right of women to vote at school-elections in a dozen States, full suffrage in two Territories, all have been gained through the legislatures. Had any one of these beneficent propositions been submitted to the vote of the rank and file do you believe a majority would have placed their sanction upon it? I do not; and I beg you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that you will at once recommend to the House the submission of the proposition now before you, and thus place the decision of this great constitutional question of the right of one-half the people of this Republic to a voice in the Government, with the legislatures of the several States. You need not fear that our enfranchisement will come too suddenly or too soon by this method. After the proposition shall have passed Congress by the requisite two-thirds vote, it may require five, ten or twenty years to secure its ratification by the necessary three-fourths of the State legislatures; but, *once submitted by Congress, it always will stand until ratified by the States.*

"It takes all too many of us women from our homes and from the works of charity and education in our respective localities, even to come

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Washington, session after session, until Congress shall have submitted the proposition, and then to go from legislature to legislature, urging its adoption. But when you insist that we shall beg at the feet of each individual voter of every one of the States, native and foreign, black and white, learned and ignorant, you doom us to incalculable hardships and sacrifices, and to most exasperating insults and humiliations. I pray you to save us from the fate of waiting and working for our freedom until we shall have educated the ignorant masses of men to consent to give their wives and sisters equality of rights with themselves. You surely will not compel us to await the enlightenment of all the freedmen of this nation and the newly-made voters from the monarchical governments of the Old World!

"Liberty for one's self is a natural instinct possessed alike by all men, but to be willing to accord liberty to another is the result of education, of self-discipline, of the practice of the golden rule. Therefore, we ask that the question of equality of rights to women shall be decided by the picked men of the nation in Congress, and the picked men of the several States in their respective legislatures."

Sometimes these Committees reported favorably, sometimes unfavorably, but generally they did not report at all. Eleven favorable reports have been made—five from Senate, six from House, Committees. It is a noteworthy fact that from 1879 to 1891, when Miss Anthony was enabled to spend the Congressional season in Washington, nine of these favorable reports were made. Committees of the first three Congresses after she ceased remaining in that city for the winter, reported adversely—in 1892-4-6,—and since that time there has been no report of any kind. Could there be a better illustration of the powerful influence she was able to exert?

Many members of Congress and constitutional lawyers held that women really were entitled to vote under Section I of Amendment XIV, which declares that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States." Acting under legal advice, Miss Anthony determined to test her rights, and, in November, 1872, with but slight objection from the election-inspector she registered and voted the full ticket. She was arrested, and, although she testified that she voted conscientiously, under legal advice, believing it to be her right, she was charged with committing a *crime,* her writ of *habeas corpus* denied and her bail fixed at $1,000. Her trial was set for the May term of court in Rochester, and in March she started out to canvass Monroe County, not to argue

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her case, but to see that the people were educated upon the constitutional points involved. Being informed that the District Attorney threatened to move her trial into another county because she would prejudice the jury, she notified him that then she would see that that county also was thoroughly canvassed, and asked him if she were prejudicing a jury by reading and explaining the Constitution of the United States. She spoke in twenty-nine post-office districts and then he did change the case to Canandaigua, when she immediately began speaking in Ontario County. As the time was so short, she called to her assistance that able debater, Mrs. Matilda Joslyn Gage, who spoke in sixteen places on "The United States on trial, not Susan B. Anthony." Miss Anthony spoke in twenty-one places on the question, "Is it a crime for a citizen of the United States to vote?" Her Constitutional Argument delivered during this canvass was a masterpiece of clear, strong, logical reasoning, which never has been excelled in the Senate or before the Supreme Court of the United States. If all that ever has been said on the subject of the suffrage for woman should be blotted out and this alone remain, it would establish forever woman's just, moral, equitable and fundamental right to the ballot.

The trial of Miss Anthony opened on June 17th, 1873, Ward Hunt, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court being on the bench, and United States District Attorney Richard Crowley prosecuting. She was ably represented by her counsel, Judge Henry R. Selden and the Hon. John Van Voorhis, of Rochester. The Court refused to permit Miss Anthony to testify as to the intention or belief under which she voted, holding that she was not competent as a witness in her own behalf. After listening to the arguments of counsel on both sides, Justice Hunt, not having left the bench in the mean time, delivered a *written* opinion, and at its close *directed the jury to bring in a verdict of "guilty!"* Miss Anthony's counsel insisted that the Court had no power to make such a direction in a criminal case and demanded that the jury be permitted to bring in its own verdict. The Justice made no reply, except to order the clerk to register the verdict. Mr. Selden demanded that the jury be polled. Justice Hunt refused, and discharged the jury without even asking if they agreed upon a verdict. Afterwards several of them declared that they would have brought in a verdict of "not guilty."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The next day Justice Hunt denied the motion for a new trial, and then occurred that remarkable scene, when the wronged womanhood of all the ages seemed to speak through Miss Anthony, standing there at the bar where Justice herself had been brutally violated. When at last she was silenced, the Justice assessed a fine of $100 and costs, and she answered: "I will never pay a dollar of your unjust penalty. All I possess is a debt of $10,000 incurred by publishing my paper, 'The Revolution,' the sole object of which was to educate all women to do exactly as I have done—rebel against your man-made, unjust, unconstitutional forms of law, which tax, fine, imprison and hang women, while denying them the right of representation in the Government. I will work with might and main to pay every dollar of that honest debt, but not a penny shall go to this unjust claim, and I will continue to urge on all women that "resistance to tyranny is obedience to God."*

Miss Anthony never did pay this fine, which always stood against her, and the only reason it was not collected by law was that she had no property which could be levied on. She never asked President Grant to remit this fine, as has been so often stated, but she did ask for the pardon of the inspectors, who were found guilty, and this was granted by the President. She carried her own case to the Congress of the United States because she had been denied the right of trial by jury guaranteed by the National Constitution, but Committees from Senate and House declined to take action, and the case stands to-day as one of the greatest of judicial outrages.

A notable accomplishment in this life of illustrious deeds, one which will stand for all time, is seen in the four large volumes, "History of Woman Suffrage." They should have a more comprehensive title, for they include the invaluable records of the wonderful progress of women along all lines during the past century. In their actual writing Miss Anthony called other women to her assistance, but to her alone is due their inception, the collecting of material, the persistence which constantly pushed this work through a period of over ten years, the raising of money, the drudgery of publishing, and finally the placing of these books in all the large libraries of this country and Europe. To this last

* Full reports of this trial are contained in the "Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony" and the "History of Woman Suffrage," Vol. II.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

task the later years of her life were almost wholly given. Except for her foresight, her energy and her perseverance, the history of the evolution of woman would be forever buried in obscurity, for it exists only in these volumes. The present and future generations must also feel indebted to Miss Anthony for having preserved in her Biography the story of her own life, which is so closely interwoven with the warp and woof of the destiny of all women henceforth to the end of time.

Another memorial of Miss Anthony's marvellous executive power may be seen in the International Council of Women, whose membership of millions extends around the globe. It was while in Europe in 1883 that she and Mrs. Stanton took the first steps toward bringing the women of different nations together in organization. With the cooperation of other capable women, Miss Anthony spent several years in perfecting the plans that finally culminated in the forming of the International Council at Washington in 1888, which now has its national auxiliaries in over twenty countries. At its Congresses in London in 1899 and in Berlin in 1904, women of literally the whole world joined in a magnificent ovation to their acknowledged leader, Susan B. Anthony.

On the evening of February 15th, the eighty-sixth birthday of Miss Anthony was celebrated in Washington, the city which had welcomed her so many times during the past forty years. Letters of congratulation were read from the President of the United States, from Senators, Representatives, many distinguished men and women. Those she loved were gathered around her, and all about was the earnest, sympathetic audience which had ever been her inspiration. Robed in her soft, black gown, relieved as always with delicate lace, her silver hair parted over her noble brow, she sat there just as she had so many times before—and yet there was a difference. The great reformer, the orator, the planner of campaigns, seemed to have faded into the background and left instead only the beautiful, beloved woman, with an expression so spiritual that to every heart came the thrill of sorrowful thought, This is the last! One month from that night the snow was falling on her new-made grave.

IDA HUSTED HARPER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: ST. PETERSBURG: VIENNA: WASHINGTON.

March, 1906.

In my last communication, I remarked that the advent of fifty-one Labor men into the British Parliament, twenty-nine of whom are pledged to act independently of both Liberals and Conservatives, is a really memorable development, first, because it foreshadows the growth of the Continental group system in English politics—there being now in the House of Commons four distinct parties; secondly, because it is a token that the working-classes are becoming conscious of their political power, are throwing off the domination of caste and social influences, and are determined for the future to be represented in the national legislature by men of their own class who will vote with an exclusive regard to the interests of that class; and, thirdly, because their irruption must profoundly affect the social and political evolution of the country. Under these three heads most, if not all, of the possibilities of the new Labor party are, I believe, fairly comprised. That is to say, Englishmen are asking themselves how far it is likely to influence the workings of the two-party system, and even whether that system is not already at an end. They are also speculating on the direction in which it will affect the future of Liberalism. If the Continent of Europe is any guide on such a point, the answer is not hard to find. Everywhere on the Continent, Liberalism of the old type, the Liberalism that devoted itself to pulling down and levelling, seems to have exhausted its mandate and to have been superseded by a militant and constructive Socialism. It is looking far ahead to assume that such must necessarily be the course of events in England. So long as the House of Lords exists, English Liberalism of the kind one associates with the names of Russell and Gladstone has still its work to do. But I see little reason to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

think that, in the work of social reform, of building up, the Liberalism of England is any more likely to succeed than the Liberalism of the Continent; and the possibility that it will put itself at the head of the Labor movement seems to me to have less likelihood than the possibility that it will be chained to its chariot wheels. Again, Englishmen are deeply concerned in trying to forecast the social significance of the Labor party—a subject that deserves an article to itself. They are conscious, or most of them at any rate are conscious, that the failings of their country lie rather in the social than in the political sphere, and that flunkeyism, and all that is implied in it, represents an evil more pervasive and more debilitating than any number of political anomalies or inequalities. If the Labor party helps to eradicate flunkeyism and so infect the English working-classes with something of the American spirit of buoyancy and self-respect, it will have laid the foundations of a real *risorgimento*. And, finally, Englishmen are canvassing the attitude of the Labor men towards the immediate questions and political combinations of the hour, and are wondering how far they will succeed in pushing the Government along the road they desire to see it tread.

There are one or two points connected with the Labor party on which there seem to be misapprehensions among Americans. In the first place, England as a whole is very far from being alarmed by its advent. The country realizes that a change is taking place; it does not admit for one moment that that change amounts to what on the Continent is called "the Revolution"; it is not seriously disturbed—why should it be?—by the fact that the working-classes, who for over twenty years have enjoyed seven-tenths of the voting power of the country, should now be using that power for their own ends; and it relies as confidently as ever upon the sound sense and conservatism of the nation to restrain any little extravagancies that the new movement, in its first moments of exaltation, may be guilty of. The old and tried institutions of the land never seemed to rest on a surer basis, and there is more than a little force in the contention that the rise of a Labor party is less an attack upon the existing system than a token that the existing system is preparing to adapt itself to new conditions. No one in England imagines that, because fifty-one working-men have been elected to the House of Commons, the deluge has begun. It is recognized that many

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

special circumstances, such as are not likely to be found in conjunction again, combined to secure their election. One was the Taff Vale judgment (on which I shall have a word to say later on), and the injudicious and somewhat contemptuous refusal of the late Government to reverse it. That refusal practically flung down the gage to every trade-unionist in the country, and no diagnosis of the Labor successes can be held complete which does not recognize that they were won, not by Socialism, but by trade-unionism. Again, the Chinese labor question, the fiscal issue, and the alarming decline in the manners and efficiency of the House of Commons, told heavily in favor of a party that was not only new, but could claim a peculiar right of appeal to working-class sentiment. So favoring a combination of circumstances will scarcely occur again. Moreover, it is a law of politics that changes are rarely followed by greater changes, but rather by a reaction towards the old order. The Labor party will be just as much subject to the swing of the pendulum as any other party. It has also to be remembered that the Labor candidates were elected by the votes of organized labor, and that behind the ranks of organized labor stand the far larger ranks of unorganized labor, whose members are in no way disposed to take their orders either from trade-unionism or from Socialism, and who, indeed, are widely removed from both. Bearing all this in mind, England while deeply interested in, is by no means terrified by, the Labor party. The expectation is that it will increase, but not at a rate that need cause a rational man any alarm, and not along lines that will threaten any of the foundations of the State. I need scarcely say that the Labor men themselves take a far more optimistic view of their future than this, and fully expect in the course of the next ten or fifteen years to be the controlling power in the land. What I have said must be taken as representing average detached opinion.

There is another misconception as to the Labor party and the men who compose it that seems to prevail very largely in America. They are spoken of as though they belonged to the agitating kind of demagogues. On the contrary, they are men of an extremely practical, businesslike and unrhetorical turn. It would probably be impossible to pick out fifty-one members of the House of Commons whose combined experience in administrative work, and whose knowledge of the realities of the people's life,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would equal those of the fifty-one Labor members. With the exception of three or four, all of them have earned their living by manual work for weekly wages. They have risen in the confidence of their fellow workers, not through any gift of eloquence, but by reason of their native shrewdness and capacity for organization, and because their judgment, honesty and turn for affairs have been thoroughly tested in the management of trade-unions and benevolent societies. A great many of them have already served for years on the local councils of their neighborhood. All of them go to the legislature for the unique purpose of legislating. All of them "mean business," and enter upon their new duties in a spirit of grim, hard-headed earnestness. Into the somewhat languid and over-elegant atmosphere of English politics they will import a wholesome example of laborious efficiency. Politics to them is not a sport, nor a spring-board from which to leap into social or professional fame. It is a business. They are the salaried representatives of a class—a class accustomed to "getting its money's worth," and anything but tolerant towards those who fail to obtain results. No doubt, the Labor men will use language and introduce a standard of behavior of which the House of Commons has hitherto had little experience. But to represent them as noisy agitators is to misapprehend them entirely.

I have spoken so far of the Labor party as one. In reality, it is composed of three groups who may not on all questions be found in harmony. The most important of these groups is the section controlled by the Labor Representation Committee. The L. R. C. includes trade-unions, trades-councils, Socialist societies and cooperative associations. It has only been in existence some six years, but its membership already amounts to nearly a million. Its object is "to secure, by united action, the election to Parliament of candidates promoted, in the first instance, by an affiliated society or societies in the constituency, who undertake to form or join a distinct group in Parliament, with its own whips and its own policy on labor questions, to abstain strictly from identifying themselves with, or promoting the interests of, any section of the Liberal or Conservative party, and not to oppose any other candidate recognized by this Committee." All candidates who subscribe to these pledges are paid twenty-five per cent. of their election expenses and two hundred pounds a year during the term

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of their service in Parliament. Of the fifty-one Labor members in the House, twenty-nine were elected under the auspices of the Labor Representation Committee, and form accordingly a separate group under the leadership of Mr. Keir Hardie. Of the remaining twenty-two Labor members, sixteen are miners' representatives, who stand apart from Mr. Keir Hardie and his friends, are somewhat coldly regarded by the Socialists who compose the inner and guiding section of the Labor Representation Committee, and look upon themselves rather as the advance wing of the Liberal party than as an independent Labor section. In addition, there are a few members who, while Labor men in fact and in sympathies, answer to no more precise definition, being for the most part the representatives of special trades and occupations, such as cotton, railroads, printing and so on. It is, however, worth noting that of the total of fifty-one members, all but ten are trade-unionists; and it is on that fact that observers base the prediction that ultimately all the Labor members will be united into a compact and distinct party under a single leadership. If such unity is achieved, it can only be on a foundation of compromise. Trade-unionists in England, speaking generally, are not Socialists, and the miners' representatives in particular have little or no sympathy with what Mr. Keir Hardie has described as the supreme object of his policy—the creation, namely, of a cooperative commonwealth founded upon the socialization of land and capital, and the "nationalization of all the means of production, distribution and exchange." Labor, therefore, in England is at present more of a generic term than a specific party label. It covers many real divergences of policy and instinctive outlook. Their reality may be best appreciated by the fact that Mr. Keir Hardie recently wrote two long articles on the Labor movement in some English reviews without once mentioning the name of Mr. John Burns.

There are, however, certain measures on which it is likely that all sections of the Labor party will be at one. The payment of members, I may add, is not one of them, in spite of the fact that it was endorsed on March 7th by an overwhelming majority in the House of Commons. The reason is obvious. The trade-unions and the Labor Representation Committee have found that they can support their own representatives in the House by imposing upon all their members the ridiculously small tax of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two cents a head. The State payment of Members of Parliament, therefore, so far from benefiting them would be of positive disservice by opening the doors of Parliament to a facile crowd of lawyers, journalists and carpetbaggers. The chief matter that concerns the Labor party is the legal position of trade-unions. The Taff Vale case decided that, if a trade-union broke the law, it could be restrained by injunction and mulcted in damages. Thus the payments which trade-unionists have made to "benefit" funds can be debited with the damages which a court of law may inflict for acts committed in a strike by trade-union officials in contravention of the law. To regulate what they hold to be this grave injustice and to save their benefit funds are the first objects of the Labor group. Again, the law is in a state of chaos on the subject of "picketing." John Jones may advise people not to work for the Great Western Railway. If the officials of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants do the same thing, they break the law. One person cannot "conspire." A number of persons can. Recent decisions have declared that trade-unions, as corporations, are not only legally capable of doing wrong, but far more capable than private individuals. Moreover, the definition of what constitutes "picketing" has recently grown harsher and more exacting. These are both grievances that the trade-unions are determined to redress. Again, they are interested in extending the scope of the Workmen's Compensation Act and in securing State contributions to workmen's insurance funds. Most of them, too, are anxious to have the principle recognized that it is the duty of the State to find and provide work for the unemployed. Practically all of them favor a purely secular system of education, and are agreed in desiring the enforcement of trade-union wages in public contracts, in improving the conditions of Government employment and in advocating the compulsory sale of land and its division into small allotments. The present Government, however, is not a Radical, still less is it a Socialist, Government. Its leaders are the representatives of the conservative middle classes, where they are not the representatives of the aristocracy. They are friendly to the Labor party, but will not hesitate to withstand its extreme demands; and, if we in England are really on the eve of the long-expected conflict between Labor and Capital, the first token of it may be looked for in a quarrel between Labor and Liberalism.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ST. PETERSBURG, *March, 1906.*

CONTRARY to common belief, the Autocracy has but reeled, not fallen. Since last February, thanks to the robust loyalty of the army, it has temporarily recovered its equilibrium, and now threatens, not only to minimize the promises which it made to the nation last October, but even to take back some of the concessions granted. True, as yet no irrevocable step backwards has been taken, no fatal word has been spoken by Nicholas II. On the contrary, in the only speech which he deliberately uttered to the deputations that went to Tsarskoye Selo to beseech him to resume absolute power, he showed a praiseworthy resolve to keep his promise and govern the Empire constitutionally. "*Quod scripsi scripsi*" he virtually said; and, displaying the courage of Pilate, he refused to recede from the position once taken up. But now, swayed by influences which are many and intimate, he is said to be washing his hands of Liberalism in every shape and form. At first it was urged that the title "Autocrat," meaning only an independent monarch, might and should be retained, could not indeed be dropped without offending the monarch who had borne it. Then it was pointed out that, as the Tsar had nowhere expressly said that he restricted his powers, they were as absolute now as ever; and, lastly, it was argued that there is one thing which even a Russian Tsar cannot do—he cannot renounce absolutism. And now the political pendulum is swinging towards despotism again.

The symptoms of this change—as yet one sees only symptoms—are numerous and very significant: needless arrests, uncalled-for restrictions, the employment of repression as a preventive of evil that might never have come, and, last but not least, the attitude of the Tsar himself. That the Government should put down the armed rising by ungentle measures was natural, for it was engaged in a struggle to the death, and the troops were embittered by acts of treachery and revolting cruelty. But when the fight was almost over, and the insurgents worsted, it was a foolish policy and an unfavorable symptom to allow men to be executed after a very flimsy inquiry and a very hurried trial. Strength is patient. Again, in districts quite distant from the civil war, many innocent individuals were seized and put in prison on mere suspicion, and set free a week or fortnight later without apology or explanation. It is understood that Count Witté, who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is the official head of the Government, was strongly and violently opposed to all these ill-advised measures, but that, on appealing to the Emperor, he was assured by the monarch that repression was peremptorily necessary, that it was carefully restricted to those who had done something to merit it, and was fairly adjusted to the varying degrees of guilt. That was the view adopted by the Tsar. Behind the Tsar stood M. Durnovo. Now, Durnovo, the acting Home Secretary, is an official whose name connotes a whole political programme, and whose acts appear to be inspired by a taste for systematic coercion as a *régime*. He is a noteworthy man. Dismissed from office by Alexander III, who used very strong and damaging language respecting him, he was demurred to by Nicholas II when Count Witté submitted his name as a candidate for office in a "business cabinet." "That man Durnovo!" the Emperor exclaimed when the Premier mentioned him. "No, no! My father cashiered him for certain backslidings, and I have no confidence in him." "Well, but we have nobody else, Your Majesty, who knows the machinery of home Government so well as he, and that is unhappily the most important branch of the administration at present. Besides, we want him only for a short time, and it is not necessary that he be made minister. The title of 'acting-minister' will be quite enough." "Very well, be it as you say," was the reply, and Durnovo's star thereupon began to rise.

All that happened less than six months ago. To-day, Durnovo is the Tsar's man. His will, entwined in that of the Tsar, is law. He is the real ruler of Russia. He it is who presses the button which kills suspected people, which burns huts and hovels, imprisons the innocent together with the guilty, and is fanning the embers of civil war. But the most grotesque aspect of the matter is that, whereas Durnovo breaks, it is Witté who pays with his name and reputation. He is the nominal head of the Government, but in truth he is the scapegoat of the Autocracy. All the credit he had gained by the Portsmouth Peace Treaty, by the introduction of the gold standard into Russia, by the creation of a native industry, by the repeal of religious persecutions, and by the manifesto of October, is being sacrificed at the shrine of the Autocracy; and for a whole generation Witté will remain under a cloud. His bitterest enemy is the very official who, without his intercession, would never have been admitted to high office.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If the most cruel action of Durnovo was the sanguinary repression of the insurrectionary movement after it had ceased to be dangerous, the most harmful, perhaps one might add fatal, effect of his baleful influence was the friendly attitude of the Tsar towards a deputation which was sent by a reactionary political party. The fundamental principle of that party is that, without the Autocracy, without a monarch having unbounded power, Russia is doomed to destruction, and that there is one step which even an autocrat has no right to take: the limitation of his own powers. That party was received and welcomed by Nicholas II, although its avowed aim and object is to thwart the scheme put forward by Nicholas himself in his October manifesto. Now, a monarch, one would think, ought to be the head of all legal parties and the protector of none. It seems particularly odd that the Tsar should single out for special distinction and favor the one association which condemns the liberty he granted to his people, and strives to hinder its embodiment in institutions. His people regard it as symptomatic. But a sensational touch was given to the incident when the members of the delegation, emboldened by His Majesty's friendly advances, actually presented to him and to the baby Tsarevitch the badges of their reactionary party! How can the Russian people any longer put faith in the Emperor's intentions to fulfil the solemn promises made last October for himself and his son, if he has accepted the badge of a party which condemns all concessions to the nation as disastrous?

And now, therefore, the whole question, which for a time seemed settled, has cropped up again: Will the Court treat the stipulations of the October manifesto as it treated the engagements taken towards Finland, and, ignoring them, endeavor to introduce the *status quo ante?* Is the hope, which many still entertain, that Russia will now enter the ranks of adult nations, and develop a constitution answering to her own needs, chimerical? Many thinking people here in the country itself maintain that all such hopes are vain, and for that reason they openly or secretly favor a return to revolutionary methods. They are even ready to attack the State, to undermine its finances, and thwart its foreign policy, for the sake of obtaining the measure of reform which they deem indispensable. They would burn down the house in order to roast the pig. And that section of the population is one element of the present situation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The clergy is another factor; but, unhappily, one cannot say much for the political attitude or the intellectual resources of the Church Militant in Russia. There is, doubtless, a leaven of good and holy men among them, but it is too insignificant, too powerless, to raise the general level of the order. And when the blind lead the blind, a like dismal fate overtakes the leaders and the led. Unfortunately, some of the liberally disposed ecclesiastics whose politics are modern, and whose intelligence is developed, are ruled out of court by their ethical idiosyncrasies. In their case the spirit may be willing, but the flesh is very weak. The Muscovite prelates, on the other hand, men of decided dogmatic views, fanatical resolve and theologico-political intolerance, will listen to no talk of a change in the framework of the State.

Curiously characteristic of clergy and people—of the people who quench their religious thirst at the almost exhausted source of Russian theology—is a horrible drama which one of the journals of St. Petersburg narrates in gruesome detail. A priest lives in Cronstadt, named Father John, whom thousands of Russians regard or, until last October, regarded as a saint able to read men's thoughts, pierce the veil of futurity and work miracles at will. Other thousands, on the contrary, look down upon him as a charlatan, a mischief-maker, a false prophet. His most ardent followers—one of whom proclaimed herself the Virgin-Mother of God—are sectarians of the most fanatical sort. In the village of Upper Yelshanka, the Joannites, as they are termed, hold that Father John is an incarnation of the God of Sabaoth, and in order to worship him fittingly they recently sacrificed a woman in his honor, a woman aged forty-one, the mother of a family of five! That, they affirmed, was a sacrifice worthy of the Almighty, and all the more acceptable because the victim herself was willing and even eager to die for her faith. So well pleased were these misguided people with their ghastly act of worship, that they were making ready to sacrifice two other women, when the police, informed by the common-sense villagers, interfered and hindered the slaughter. Such are among the most intelligent of the masses for whom universal suffrage is clamorously claimed by the radical few.

Of all the Liberal factions in the country, the best organized and most popular, because most democratic, is the so-called Constitutional Democratic Party, composed of representatives of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Zemstvos, of journalists, lawyers and members of non-Russian nationalities who expect political salvation from universal suffrage, and demand a number of other reforms for which most European peoples are still patiently waiting. This numerous body held a congress recently to determine its attitude toward the Duma. The result is very interesting and quite characteristic. The first question put was: "Shall we take part in the elections?" To which the almost unanimous answer was, "Yes." "Shall we enter the Duma?" was the second query proposed, and the reply was also in the affirmative, only two voices dissenting. Then came the crucial issue: "Are we to work in the Duma as in a normal institution?" To which every vote recorded gave a negative answer. The Duma, therefore, will not be regarded as a normal body in the State, to be treated as an embryonic parliament, the custodian of the people's rights, the champion of its claims, but simply as an assembly which is here to-day and gone to-morrow. It is a mere stop-gap. That attitude may prove fatal to the Duma itself, and destructive of all reasonable hopes based upon its labors. In other words, the Liberals, who threw away a magnificent opportunity of establishing constitutional government last October, are now about to fritter away another chance, which may not soon return.

To the left of the Constitutional Democratic Party stand the Social Democrats and Social Revolutionists, whose faith is in firearms, rifles, field-guns and dynamite bombs, and whose organization is admirably compact. These men, or many of them, are quite ready to die for their convictions at a moment's notice; but, in order to increase their number by those colleagues who prefer to live, they demand the abolition of capital punishment throughout the Empire. Being single-minded, sharp-sighted and firmly resolved, they wield a degree of influence out of all proportion to their number. It was those men who organized the railway, postal and telegraph strikes, and for a time appeared to be within an ace of success.

The insurrection having fizzled out, the parties of violence resolved to inaugurate a reign of terror. "We will take a leaf," they said, "from the book of our Polish friends who are wiping out all the prominent fighters on the side of the Autocracy, and we will spare none, not even police officers of low rank, whom mediocrity has hitherto saved." They kept their word, as usual.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Murder followed murder with rapidity, and the ease with which the assassins made good their escape intensified the dismay of the Government. In the course of one week, the Governor-General of Moscow, the acting Minister of the Interior and Count Witté himself were requested by the police not to leave their dwellings. But it is hardly to be believed that the party which, by killing Alexander II, put off the dawn of Russian liberty for more than a quarter of a century, will repeat the blunder it then committed.

A strange document, closely typewritten on three foolscap pages and purporting to have been issued by the "Pan-Russian League of Fighters for Freedom," was recently forwarded to me, together with a written request to make the contents known in America and Europe. It is a very forcible statement of the case against the Russian Autocracy, its champions and friends, the clergy, the nobles, the landowners, capitalists and the *bourgeois* generally, and an answer to the question, "What is to be done?" Here are the words of the answer:

"With force alone can we cope with their force. They have declared war on the nation, and it behooves us therefore to look upon them much as we should regard foreign foes; it is our duty to wage a merciless and a bloody war against them. But how can that war be carried on prudently and to the best purpose? In war, all means are good in order to conquer and annihilate the enemy. First and foremost, however, it is important to husband our force, and not to expend it in vain. . . . It is necessary to awaken the consciousness and the conscience of the peasantry and of the other respectable sections of the community. Every kind of agrarian league should be founded, workingmen's Committees and Councils summoned to discuss affairs. People of the same way of thinking should be brought together, and provided with arms; fighting companies ought to be organized, and measures adopted to paralyze the activity of landowners, factory proprietors, merchants and the State Treasury. Among these measures is the cessation of labor, the organization of strikes, the refusal at all costs to pay rates or taxes.

"Wherever possible, the Government should be deprived of its ill-gotten money, and for this purpose local treasuries, banks, alcohol-shops, and other places in which State funds are deposited, should be rifled: the land must be wrested from the squires, whose country-seats must be burned to cinders, while they themselves should be driven from their accursed nests."

The revolutionary programme, if indeed it be genuine and not forged by some member of the police, then goes on to describe the *modus operandi*. The chosen victims are the commanders of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the army and the police. There is a whole army of heroic men, the programme continues, ready to forfeit their lives in the cause of the nation, but unable to cope with the Imperial armies in the field.

"For this reason at the present moment the most practical, the most profitable, means of combat is the creation of independent little fighting groups and secret societies, and also the action of individual champions concentrating all their efforts on the destruction of every rank and condition of members, servants and agents of the Government, beginning at the very highest rung of the ladder and ending with the lowest, once it is shown that they have cooperated with the Government in its war with the people. As enemies of the nation we have to consider all those who, to any extent, actively oppose the movement in favor of freedom. They must all be treated as enemies are treated in war-time: wheresoever found they should be destroyed, together with their property and their kindred.

"From this point of view, it is helpful to kill not only ministers, courtiers of all ranks, Generals, Governors, commanders of troops, gendarmes, police-detectives and spies . . . but also priests who speak or act against popular liberties, landowners who appeal to the authorities for protection against the people, heads of industrial firms who shut up their factories or call in the soldiers and the police."

If this be the revolutionists' way of promoting the cause of freedom and enlightenment in Russia, the ill-starred people of that country may well exclaim: "Save me from my friends!"

All reasonable Russia would consequently be arrayed against them, were it not for the mischievous effect produced by the reactionaries who hanker after the old despotism, which would leave to them the exercise of absolute power and to the Tsar the responsibility for its abuse.

VIENNA, *March, 1906.*

AT this delicate juncture of European affairs, Austria-Hungary is again, and with good reason, attracting universal attention. People wonder what will be the upshot of the violent recrudescence of domestic difficulties with which this indispensable element of international tranquillity finds itself confronted. Those who clearly realize the vital importance of the part played by this great and ancient monarchy in the equilibrium of the Powers, and in the peace and prosperity of Europe, ask themselves anxiously whether it will once more weather the storm that lowers so menacingly upon its political horizon.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fortunately, dark as the outlook unquestionably is, an impartial survey of the situation tends to show that it is, on the whole, less desperate than people have been disposed to imagine. One decidedly reassuring feature is that Europe is more than ever alive to the fact that the integrity of the Hapsburg dominions is essential to its own self-preservation and its protection from an intolerable Prussian hegemony. This cardinal fact has latterly been strongly impressed upon it by the restlessness and mischief-making of the Kaiser and his Government, which have excited the apprehensions of almost all the neighboring states.

If Austria-Hungary be saved from foreign interference, German as well as Russian, her peoples are quite capable of working out their own salvation. Indeed, so far as the Austrian half of the Dual Monarchy is concerned, they have made a great step in advance in the introduction by the Government, on February 23rd, of the Bill substituting universal suffrage for the former system of class representation, which was a gratuitous additional source of dissension in a country made up of so many nationalities and languages. The good sense of the German element in Austria has enabled it to eliminate the worst of the poison of the imported Pan-Germanic agitation that did so much mischief a few years ago,—a result to which Germany's "dumping" methods in her ally's territory have largely contributed, as have also her not unsuccessful efforts to oust Austrian industry from its own special preserves, the Balkan States. The Hungarians, on the other hand, have quite recovered from their old deference to the political wisdom of Berlin, bitter experience having proved that their confidence in the lavish flatteries of William II, and in the professions of his Government, did not save them from Pan-Germanic agitation among their own fellow subjects of German nationality in Transylvania, nor from the sacrifice of their economic interests in the hard bargain forced upon them in defiance of their Parliamentary majority—the commercial treaty with the German Empire. Everything considered, it is evident that the Austrian half of the Dual Monarchy has fairly entered upon the path of progress, and that its present troubles, serious though they may appear, are but the growing-pains and juvenile ailments of a young and vigorous representative system.

One of the unavowed causes of the popularity somewhat suddenly acquired by the Opposition parties in Hungary, which have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now become the Coalition majority, cannot be publicly discussed in this country. It was the desire of the Magyar element, who are devoted to their Liberal institutions, to take precautions in advance against the reactionary tendencies of the heir-apparent, the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, and they feared that the Government party, which had been in power so long, had become too subject to Court influence to insist upon the modifications of the existing system which they considered indispensable. The Hungarians know the school in which their future sovereign was taught, and the manner in which his father, the late Archduke Karl Ludwig, was accustomed to speak of his specific for overcoming the resistance of a Parliamentary majority to the royal will—namely, the vigorous employment of loyal Austrian troops. It was this knowledge that made them desire more effective control over their own part of the common army.

The cavalier fashion in which the Emperor-King treated the leaders of the Hungarian Coalition majority, whom he summoned to Vienna merely to receive his ultimatum, in the form of a refusal to consider their claim that the employment of the German language should be abandoned in the Hungarian regiments of the army, is believed to have been prompted by his meddling ally the German Emperor. It is suspected that the resumption of absolutist methods has been encouraged from the same quarter, though prompted nearer home. The experience and prudence of the old Sovereign, who is in his seventy-sixth year, justifies the hope, however, that he will scarcely allow himself to be tempted too far into an open conflict with the Hungarian people, thus running the risk of being again obliged to resort to that brutal military repression to which he found himself committed on ascending the throne in 1848 as a boy of eighteen. Besides, he has frequently shown that he is docile to experience and capable of abandoning a policy when it proves unworkable. He will need fresh resources for the new artillery, and he cannot well afford to forego the cooperation of the Hungarian Parliament in raising them. Nor can he be blind to the significance of the warning recently given by the Austrian Chamber of Peers as to the necessity of a constitutional *régime* in Hungary for the effective working of the "Delegations," which may be described as a joint committee of the Austrian and Hungarian Legislatures.

The present Hungarian Ministry, drawn from the Parliament-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ary minority, has proposed, with the previous sanction of the Crown, to grant universal suffrage. This is evidently with the object of mobilizing the masses, and particularly the non-Magyar element, against the Coalition majority which refused to take office unless their programme were accepted by the Sovereign. The prospect thus opened up to the unenfranchised population will profoundly modify the conditions of the struggle at the General Elections, which, according to the Constitution, must be held in May. But the Coalition leaders and their organs in the press have already begun to pay court, not only to the masses, who have long been prepared by an active Socialist propaganda, but to the non-Magyar element. It is not impossible that they may succeed in outbidding their opponents, who are handicapped by the circumstance that they are working in concert with the Austrian advisers of the Crown, and against the national sentiment of their own race. The result of these elections will inevitably have a great effect upon the Emperor-King, as well as upon the new Parliament. By showing both exactly how they stand towards the country, they will clear the ground for a compromise that might have been secured before now if Berlin had been wise enough to avoid interfering in a family difference. Indeed, a compromise might possibly have been concluded ere this, had the Emperor-King consented to part with his Foreign Minister, Count Goluchowski, who is the *bête noire* of the Hungarian majority and has indeed few friends in Austria.

Although the coming elections in Hungary will, doubtless, strengthen the hands of the majority, whose policy thus far has been somewhat unfortunate owing to the lack of harmony between its leaders, the latter are sure to think twice before letting their difference with the Sovereign drift to extremes, thus running the risk of having to fight out the quarrel with the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, an obstinate and headstrong Prince who is understood to have very different views on government from those of his future Hungarian subjects.

Great as are the difficulties to be overcome, there is reason to anticipate that, (1) as a consequence of the scheme of Universal Suffrage now before the Austrian Reichsrath, a working compromise between the nationalities of this half of the Dual Monarchy will eventually be secured under the conciliatory influence of a genuinely representative system; and (2) that the inevitable re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vision—predicted in my presence in 1898 by that far-seeing Magyar statesman, the late Desider Szilagyi—of the terms of the existing *Ausgleich,* or terminable compact regulating the economic and monetary relations between the Austrian and Hungarian halves of the Dual Monarchy, will be made. This *Ausgleich* constituting the two countries into a common customs territory, after the manner of the states of the German Empire, expires next year, and must be renewed on terms acceptable to both, while leaving each more liberty than it has had in economic affairs. If this double task be fulfilled (and both peoples recognize it as essential, not only to their welfare, but to their very existence), it is practically certain that their common interests and the outside pressure to which they are subjected will once more exercise their full unifying influence upon this extraordinary mosaic of nationalities. The Dual Monarchy will then be in a better position than ever before to fulfil its beneficent mission of protecting and promoting the development of the Balkan States, and of acting as a bulwark against the Pan-Germanic ambition which aims at the disintegration of the Hapsburg dominions, the extension of the German Confederation to the Adriatic, and a hegemony over the rest of Southeastern Europe and Asiatic Turkey.

Up to that comparatively recent period when, first, Czech, and then German, obstruction in the Austrian Reichsrath attracted foreign attention to its proceedings, the Parliamentary character of that assembly was more nominal than real. The Sovereign still ruled under a Parliamentary mask, with the aid of the proverbial "thirty aristocrats who govern Austria." The present system, with its excessive representation of the landed interest and latterly of the large manufacturers, which rendered this condition of affairs possible, has long since broken down, and it will now be certainly replaced at an early date by that of "universal, equal and direct suffrage." This will at the same time take the power out of the hands of the German element, and of the landowners and propertied classes generally.

What effect will this radical change have upon the relations of the Dual Monarchy with foreign countries, and more particularly with Germany and the Balkan States? This is an interesting and most important inquiry, which is suggested with particular force by recent events, such as the altered attitude towards Germany of the Hungarian majority (hitherto stalwart supporters

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Triple Alliance) and the disapproval of that same Hungarian majority, as well as of a section of the Austrian people, of the overbearing action of the Vienna Foreign Office towards Servia in the matter of the projected Customs Convention with Bulgaria. The present hostility of the Hungarians to Germany, and their obvious desire for a reconciliation with the Servians, the most important of the Slav races with which they have immediate dealings, are but the confirmation of a change that has been proceeding gradually and surely for some years past, the completion of which will in all probability deprive what Prince von Bülow has aptly and correctly styled "Prussia-Germany" of the support of Austria-Hungary in realizing her ambitions. Germany has abused her position to the detriment of her Austro-Hungarian ally—economically in the Balkans and in the commercial treaties concluded between the two Powers, and both politically and economically at Constantinople. The natural result is that she has well-nigh exhausted the patience of the two elements upon which the Alliance was based in this country, namely the Germans in Austria and the Magyars in Hungary.

The sympathy shown in both halves of the Monarchy for the Servians, in their recent conflict with the Vienna Foreign Office, is also a noteworthy sign of a spirit which promises in time to lead to a new policy towards the Balkan States. Hitherto, there were two currents of Austro-Hungarian public opinion on this matter—first, the desire of the Austrian manufacturer to guard those States as his exclusive preserve, and, secondly, the half-avowed Government policy of maintaining dissensions between them as a means of preventing their consolidation, with its corollary of a settlement of the Macedonian question in their favor. The future Austrian and Hungarian Parliaments, however, are not likely to share this desire for territorial expansion, with its concomitant increase of military expenditure. The public in this country were never enthusiastic about the acquisition of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It has only served as a somewhat poor consolation to their defeated dynasty, and, if it were not regarded as a stage on the way to Salonica in some indefinite future, they would often wonder what they were doing there.

But when King Victor Emmanuel, son-in-law of the Prince of Montenegro, ascended the Italian throne, this dream of expansion began to fade, and would seem doomed to vanish altogether.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Italy, which cannot abandon the Montenegrins and the results of her own work in Albania, will not permit Austria to take a footing at Salonica. Nor can Austria consent to see Italy establish herself on the Albanian coast, either at Avlona or Durazzo, thus converting the Adriatic into an Italian lake. Consequently, both Powers would appear to be checkmated, so far as territorial expansion is concerned. In these circumstances, Austria may be expected eventually to abandon her constant aim to maintain disunion among the Balkan States, and to prevent their material as well as political consolidation, as she has done, for instance, in the case of Servia, whose efforts to secure access to the Adriatic by a railway from Nisch to Skutari she has thwarted at Constantinople for ten years past. It is also to be hoped that she will abandon her systematic opposition to that one hope of a satisfactory settlement of the Macedonian question: the creation of a Balkan Confederation strong enough to justify Europe in attempting a fair partition of Macedonia between the adjoining Balkan States. There can be no doubt that the indignation of the Austrian Foreign Office against the projected Customs Convention between Servia and Bulgaria (which has now been emasculated under threat of a tariff war) was rather political than economic. Servia, practically cut off from other markets, secured from Bulgaria under that Convention the right to send her goods through the Principality to the Black Sea free of duty, but Austria would not consent to this either on commercial or political grounds, and protested that the two States had no right to conclude such a treaty. It should be remembered that Austria-Hungary made a similar protest against Servia's first Commercial Treaty, that concluded with England in 1880. Taking advantage of the privileged position given to her by the Treaty of Berlin, she ousted British trade from Servia in a fashion somewhat similar to that in which Germany is ousting her own at the present moment. But this sort of treatment cannot last forever! When diplomatic relations between England and Servia are again resumed—which will, doubtless, be very soon—it is to be expected that Great Britain, France and other disinterested European Powers that have long advised the Balkan States to come to an understanding between themselves, will help to counteract the pernicious policy of the "closed door," pursued at Constantinople by Austria and Germany. This policy is putting spokes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the wheel of progress, and, with a short-sighted and unintelligent selfishness, retarding the development of the Balkans and hampering the commerce of all the maritime States with an extensive region rich in natural resources.

WASHINGTON, *March, 1906.*

ALTHOUGH nearly four months have elapsed since the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress began, and, although three of the measures earnestly and avowedly desired by the President —to wit, the Philippine Tariff bill, the Statehood bill and the Railway Rate-Making bill—were quickly carried through the House of Representatives, not one of them has secured the approval of the Senate, and two of them are buried beyond the hope of resurrection. Only selfish motives could have prompted the stifling of the Philippine Tariff bill in the committee of the Senate to which it had been referred. As we have formerly pointed out, the only objection to this measure is that it did not go far enough. We are obviously bound in equity to treat the Philippines as well as we treat Porto Rico and Hawaii. Porto Rico enjoys absolute free trade with the United States, although her sugar and tobacco compete with our domestic products. In view of this concession to Porto Rico, the Philippine Tariff bill should have been compressed in a line that simply announced that, on and after a certain date, all products of the Philippines would be admitted to the ports of the United States, duty free. As a matter of fact, the bill provided that, while all other products of the Philippines should be exempt from duty in our ports, sugar and tobacco should pay 25 per cent. of the Dingley rates up to 1909, after which they also should be free from duty. Inadequate as it was, this proposal met with strenuous resistance on the part of the "Stand-Patters" in the House of Representatives, but in that chamber Speaker Cannon, with the assistance of Democratic members, succeeded in inflicting an overwhelming defeat upon the rebels, and in securing the performance of an act of justice. The bill then went to the Senate, where it was referred to a committee, of which a majority were "Stand-Patters" and in which consequently it was killed.

Speaker Cannon also managed to drive through the House of Representatives under whip and spur the Statehood bill for the admission into the Union of Oklahoma Territory and Indian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Territory as a single State, and also for the admission of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico as one State. The fusion of Arizona and New Mexico was hotly and persistently opposed in the House on the ground that the inhabitants of the first-named Territory were vehemently opposed to such amalgamation. The protestants, however, as we have said, were not strong enough to beat the measure in the House, but the Senate, after a prolonged debate, adopted by a majority of thirteen an amendment proposed by Senator Foraker, providing that the question whether the fusion of the two Territories should take place should be submitted to the inhabitants of Arizona and New Mexico separately, and, if a majority in either Territory should reply in the negative, the fusion should not be effected. Not satisfied, apparently, with this precaution, the Senate proceeded to adopt, by a majority of two, another amendment, excising all mention of Arizona or New Mexico from the bill. In that mutilated form, the bill was passed, and was sent to a conference committee. As we go to press, it seems probable that Speaker Cannon will insist upon instructing the House members of the conference committee to demand the enactment of the bill in its original shape; but it is expected that he will ultimately advise the House to pass the bill in its dismembered form.

As for the treaty with Santo Domingo, it has not been definitely killed, but is sleeping in the Committee on Foreign Relations. It will not be awakened and reported to the Senate until Mr. Lodge sees a better prospect of securing the votes needed for ratification than is now offered. There are in the Senate only 56 Republicans, there being a vacancy in Delaware and one Republican Senator, Burton of Kansas, being unavoidably absent. Consequently, four Democratic votes are required to constitute the prescribed two-thirds, but, since the Democratic Senators decided in caucus to oppose the measure, only two are procurable. For the present, the Santo Domingo treaty will remain in its present curious condition. We say "curious," because, while the treaty is inchoate in the United States, it is operative in Santo Domingo, where American agents designated by our Government, but appointed by the Dominican Executive, are actually discharging the collection and distribution of customs revenue in pursuance of the treaty's provisions. Whether Mr. Roosevelt has any right to act under a treaty which, as lacking ratification

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by our Senate, is for the United States no treaty at all, is a question about which constitutional lawyers differ. We ourselves should answer the question in the negative.

The Hepburn bill, which, when it left the House of Representatives, embodied the President's views and wishes regarding Government rate-making for railroads, has now become the Hepburn-Tillman bill, having been reported, unamended, by a Democratic member of the committee to which it was referred. It has undergone, in other words, the same kind of metamorphosis which the Bland bill experienced. The latter measure, it will be remembered, having left the House of Representatives under the name of its Democratic author, was reported to the Senate from the Senatorial Committee by a Republican Senator, Mr. Allison, and thus found itself transformed into the Bland-Allison bill. In the present instance, the odd result of a game of cross-purposes, and of a clash between the friends of the railroads and the friends of the President, was that those Senators who thought that the Hepburn bill went too far voted to place the reporting of it to the Senate in the hands of a Democrat who thought it did not go far enough. If the Republican friends of the Administration and the Democrats should cooperate, they could undoubtedly pass the Hepburn-Tillman bill in the form which it wore when it left the House of Representatives. If they do not come to such an agreement, the chances are that the Republicans of all shades of opinion will come to some understanding as to the crucial point, namely, the extent to which an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission may be reviewed by the Courts. What the friends of the railroads want is that the power of judicial review shall be complete, and shall include the right to suspend by injunction the operation of an order, pending the final adjudication of its validity.

It is extremely doubtful whether the power of review and the right to suspend by injunction do not inhere constitutionally in the United States Courts, and whether it is possible to limit them by legislation. From our own point of view, the prolonged and animated contest over this point is but sound and fury, signifying nothing. Suppose the utmost demand of the so-called reformers should be granted, or suppose, in other words, that the Hepburn-Tillman bill should make an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission instantly and permanently opera-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive, all judicial review and suspension by injunction being prohibited; what would it amount to? On the very first occasion when the Interstate Commerce Commission should issue a peremptory rate-making order, the railway affected would go before a United States Court and invoke the fundamental constitutional right of an American citizen, the right set forth in the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution, that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or *property* without due process of law. What is "due process of law"? The process of law which existed at the date when the first ten Amendments of the Constitution were adopted. The due process of law then included, and consequently must now include, the right of every citizen to have the validity of a Federal statute judicially tested, and, pending final adjudication, to have its operation suspended by injunction.

What is to be done about the Panama Canal? Not even the type of the canal has yet been definitely determined on, although by April 1st, tens of millions of dollars will have been expended on the Isthmus. Mr. Roosevelt's management of the canal problem is rapidly becoming an object of public derision. The specific responsibility for the conduct of the affair, which rests on Secretary Taft, has disqualified him for becoming the next Republican nominee for the Presidency. If Secretary Root is wise, he will resign sooner than acquiesce in the transfer of the Canal Strip and the construction of the interoceanic waterway to the State Department. If we may judge of the future by the past, disgust and ridicule will be the portion of any official who is called upon to handle that unlucky business. We never ought to have bought the canal franchise until after we had made up our mind as to what kind of a canal we wanted. Then, within thirty days after the purchase of the franchise, the work of excavation should have been begun in pursuance of the predetermined plan. The work of sanitation could have gone on simultaneously, as it did at Suez, and as it did at Panama under the French *régime*. One thing is certain, and that is that the Senate will not give President Roosevelt, his Secretary of War, and his subordinate appointees the free hand in dealing with tens of millions of dollars which they have had during the last three years. They should not have an additional penny until it is known whether a lock canal or a sea-level canal is to be built; and, after funds are again entrusted to them for the work

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of excavation, they should be compelled to make good by frequent and rigorous investigation. The carnival of wastefulness which, for some years, has been witnessed on the Isthmus should be summarily stopped.

It will be remembered that, three years ago, President Roosevelt, although he could find absolutely *no* authorization for the act in the Federal Constitution, intervened in the anthracite-coal strike, appointed a Commission and prevailed upon the mine-owners and the miners to agree to accept that Commission's award. The letters recently addressed by him to a conspicuous operator in the bituminous coal region, on the one hand, and to Mr. John Mitchell, the representative of the United Mine Workers, on the other, are viewed in Washington as an indication that Mr. Roosevelt intends to repeat his former unprecedented experiment. So far as the threatened strike in the bituminous coal-fields is concerned, it unquestionably should be averted. If the strike should be universal, it would put out of business all the railways in the United States that use the bituminous combustible, and would close every factory and foundry. To name but a single example of the damage it would cause, it would paralyze the colossal iron and steel industry, which, at present, is enjoying unparalleled prosperity. The arrest of that prosperity, and the prevention of railways from performing the work of transportation, would be not only economical catastrophes; they would be public crimes. Inasmuch, therefore, as Congress deliberately declined to dispute the constitutionality of the President's intervention, when it appropriated money to pay the members of the Anthracite Coal Commission, we are no doubt justified in believing that the Federal legislature, as well as public opinion, would sanction Mr. Roosevelt's interposition, so far as the bituminous mines would be affected by a strike. The case is otherwise with the anthracite mines. Here there is no pretence that the community would suffer from a strike. The reserve stocks of the anthracite companies are ample to carry consumers through the summer without any material increase in price. Under these circumstances, if the anthracite miners are not content with the extremely liberal award made by the Anthracite-Coal Strike Commission three years ago, they will deserve no pity for the consequences of their discontent, and should be allowed to bear the consequences of a concerted refusal to work.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER.

BARON SPECK VON STERNBURG

fought through the Franco-German war, and continued in active military service until 1885, when he was appointed military attaché to the German Legation at Washington. He joined the diplomatic service in 1890 and was transferred to Pekin as First Secretary to the Legation. Subsequently, he was *chargé d'affaires* at Belgrade, Servia. He was appointed First Secretary to the German Embassy at Washington in 1898, when he acted as High Commissioner on the Samoan Commission. In 1900, he was Consul-General of Germany for British India and Ceylon, and since 1903 he has been German Ambassador to the United States.

LUIGI LUZZATTI,

the famous Italian economist, was born in Venice, of Jewish parents, in 1841. He has long devoted himself to the public service of his country. For many years he has held the chair of Constitutional Law in the University of Rome. In 1882, he was Under-Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture. In 1891, he was Secretary of the Treasury in the cabinet of Rudini, and since that time he has repeatedly presided over Italian finances. He was called to the same Ministry again in February of this year. He has done more than any one else in Italy for the cause of agricultural cooperation, and he is interested in the movement for solving the problem of the housing of the poor through cooperative societies. When Mr. David Lubin projected the scheme for organizing agriculture on economic lines by means of an International Institute, he laid it before Signor Luzzatti, through whose

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

influence he obtained the audience from the King of Italy which led to His Majesty's espousing the idea and taking the initiative in its favor.

FRANK W. BLACKMAR

graduated from the University of the Pacific in 1881, and from Johns Hopkins University in 1889, when he was appointed Professor of History and Sociology in the University of Kansas. This chair he occupied for ten years, assuming in 1899 the professorship of Economics in the same University. He is the author of many important works, including "Federal and State Aid to Higher Education," "Spanish Colonization," "Spanish Institutions in the Southwest," "The Study of History and Sociology," "The Story of Human Progress" and "The Elements of Sociology."

AMERICUS

is an American citizen who, for many years, has lived and labored in the Turkish Empire. For obvious reasons his identity is not disclosed.

GEORGE STEWART BROWN

is a member of the Baltimore bar. He is a graduate of Johns Hopkins University and of the University of Maryland Law School. He has taken a practical interest in municipal politics. In 1899, he was elected to the popular branch of the City Council in which he sat through two terms, when he was elected to the upper branch of the Council, of which he is still a member. On two occasions, in 1901 and 1903, under a direct-vote system of making nominations he defeated the candidate of the "organization" in the Democratic primaries.

H. G. DAVIS

was candidate for the Vice-Presidency of the United States on the Democratic ticket in 1904. He was born in Maryland in 1823, but when quite a young man went to West Virginia to reside, and for the last half-century he has been the most prominent citizen of that State. He served in the United States Senate from 1871 to 1883. He declined reelection to engage in railroad and mining enterprises, and has since been foremost in the industrial development of the State. In 1901-2, he was Chairman of the delegation from the United States to the Second Pan-American Conference in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mexico, and made head of the Permanent Pan-American Railway Committee.

WALTER L. FLEMING

is a native of Alabama. After graduating from the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, he took a special course in history and political science in Columbia University. In 1903, he was appointed Professor of History in the University of West Virginia. During the war with Spain, he was an officer in the Third Alabama Volunteers. He is a member of a number of historical societies, and he was one of the editors of the Historians' History of the World.

HANNIS TAYLOR,

who is recognized throughout the world as one of the most eminent living authorities on constitutional history and constitutional law, was born in New Berne, North Carolina, in 1851. Having graduated at the University of his native State, he was admitted to the bar and achieved great distinction in the practice of his profession. He was appointed Minister to Spain by President Cleveland in 1893. The wide literary fame gained for Dr. Taylor by his great work on "The Origin and Growth of the English Constitution" was materially enhanced by his treatise on "International Public Law," which has been declared by a high authority to be "the most exhaustive work of its kind issued in this country since Dana's Wheaton." In recognition of the service which he had rendered to literature and learning by the publication of these works, the Universities of Dublin and Edinburgh recently conferred upon Mr. Taylor the honorary degree of LL.D. He has just published a third treatise, of a like scholarly and comprehensive character, on the "Jurisdiction and Procedure of the United States Supreme Court" upon which the Justices of that court have put the imprimatur of their high approval and commendation. Mr. Taylor represented the United States before the Alaskan Boundary Commission.

LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX

was born in Chicago. She is the daughter of a Unitarian minister, and was educated in France, Germany and England. Later, she studied for two years at the Conservatory of Leipzig, and for two years in Birmingham, England. She

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has lived in Virginia since 1887, and has been a contributor to "East and West," "The Chap-Book," "The Century," "The Outlook," "Poet-Lore," "The Times-Democrat" of New Orleans, "The Boston Transcript" and "The Evening Post" of New York. For several years, she has been a reader and adviser of one of the leading publishing houses, and has regularly contributed editorials to "Harper's Weekly."

HESTER DORSEY RICHARDSON

has given special attention to historical and genealogical research. She has written much for the magazines and for a number of leading papers with which she has been associated from time to time. She is President of the Public Records Commission of Maryland, Vice-President of the Maryland Original Research Society, and a member of the Maryland Historical Society and of the Maryland Society of Colonial Dames.

AGNES LEE

was educated in Switzerland, though she was born in Chicago. She has translated the poems of Theophile Gautier into English verse and published poems from her own pen. The poem which she contributes to this number was suggested by a tragic incident which occurred in Honolulu a few years ago.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED